

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Lawlor1967>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SOCIAL CLASS, ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION, AND
EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

by



STAN D. LAWLOR

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

AUGUST, 1967

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance a thesis entitled "Social Class, Achievement Orientation, and Expected Occupational Mobility" submitted by Stan D. Lawlor in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between achievement orientation as measured alternately by two scales, one of which appeared to have a middle class bias and another which does not seem to have this bias, and each of social class and expected occupational mobility. Sociologists who have used the scale which we believe has a middle class bias indicate that there is a positive relationship between achievement orientation and each of social class and occupational mobility. But those who have used the "non-biased" scale have reported either negative or no relationships between these variables.

Several problems are involved in comparing the various studies which have been done. One is that different studies have utilized different populations. Another is that different definitions of social class, achievement orientation and occupational mobility have been used by various authors. In this study, different scales and measurements were applied to the same group of respondents and the definitions of social class and expected occupational mobility did not change throughout. By administering two

different scales of achievement orientation it was possible to see the effect of each scale on the results.

Three schools under the Edmonton Public School Board administration in Jasper Place were studied. A total of 310 questionnaires were collected in the spring of 1967. Of these, nine questionnaires were incomplete. This left a total of 301 questionnaires for use in the study.

The findings indicate that the type of achievement orientation scale used had an important effect on the relationship between social class and achievement orientation. When the control variables of family size and mid-semester grade average were introduced the differences persisted.

In studying the relationship between achievement orientation and expected occupational mobility we found that although all of the results were in the predicted direction, the difference between the results using the Rosen and Reissman scales were not consistently high. For this reason Hypothesis 2 received only moderate support. This support was based mainly on the consistency rather than the magnitude of the differences.

Perhaps the most important contribution of this study is the clarification of the apparent contradiction which

was noted in the literature. The results show that the type of scale used has an important influence on the nature of the relationships obtained. The lower classes appear to be more highly achievement oriented when they perceive the opportunity for tangible reward whereas the middle classes appear to value achievement orientation as an end in itself.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Baha Abu-Laban who contributed of his time and experience to an extent which was far beyond that of the call of normal duty. Without his assistance it would have been impossible to complete the study at this time.

To my other committee members, Dr. P.M. George and Dr. W.D. Knill, I should also like to express my sincere thanks. A critical evaluation which was done by Dr. Walt Watson in the earlier stages of writing also proved most helpful. His contribution is gratefully acknowledged.

Many other people have provided various types of assistance in the writing of this thesis. Mr. Raymond Shaul at the Edmonton Public School Board granted permission for the administration of questionnaires in the schools. The principals at Hillcrest, Stratford, and Britannia Junior High Schools cooperated throughout the various stages of administration. The principals of these respective schools were Mr. Klukus, Mr. Brimacombe, and Mr. Schacher. Mr. Barabash, the assistant principal at Hillcrest, was also most helpful.

To Mr. Rick Linden and his colleagues who provided invaluable assistance throughout the various stages of I.B.M. processing I extend my thanks and appreciation.

Finally, I should like to acknowledge the contribution of Mrs. Ron Klingspon who has done such a competent job of typing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND	1
	Early Psychological Research	1
	Sociological Research on Social Class and Achievement	4
	Activistic-Passivistic Orientation	6
	Present-Future Orientation	7
	Familistic-Individualistic Orientation ...	8
	Achievement Orientation and Expected Occupational Mobility	18
	The Problem	21
	Significance of the Study	24
	Plan of the Thesis	25
II	METHODOLOGY	31
	Operationalizing the Variables	32
	Social Class	32
	Achievement Orientation	35
	Expected Occupational Mobility	36
	Validity and Reliability	38
	Population and Sample Studied	40
	Analysis of Data	41
	Assumptions of the Study	42

	Delimitations of the Study	42
	Limitations of the Study	43
	Summary	43
III	SOCIAL CLASS, EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: THE ROSEN SCALE	48
	Social Class and Achievement Orientation: The Rosen Scale	48
	Summary	56
	Expected Occupational Mobility and Achievement Orientation: The Rosen Scale.	57
	Summary	60
	Summary	61
IV	SOCIAL CLASS, EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: THE REISSMAN SCALE	65
	Social Class and Achievement Orientation: The Reissman Scale	65
	Summary	72
	Expected Occupational Mobility and Achievement Orientation: The Reissman Scale	73
	Summary	77
	Summary	77
V	SOCIAL CLASS, EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION	79
	Social Class and Achievement Orientation ..	79

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Expected Occupational Mobility and Achievement Orientation	88
	Summary	91
VI	SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY	92
	The Problem	92
	Summary of Findings	94
	Implications of the Study	97
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	102
	APPENDICES	108

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Social Class and Achievement Orientation: (Rosen Scale)	49
II	Social Class and Achievement Orientation by Mid-Semester Average (Rosen Scale)	51
III	Social Class and Achievement Orientation by Family Size (Rosen Scale)	53
IV	Socioeconomic Status and Achievement Orientation	55
V	Expected Occupational Mobility and Achievement Orientation by Social Class (Rosen Scale)	58
VI	Achievement Orientation and Respondent's Expected Occupation (Rosen Scale)	61
VII	Social Class and Achievement Orientation: (Reissman Scale)	66
VIII	Social Class and Achievement Orientation by Mid-Semester Average (Reissman Scale)	67
IX	Social Class and Achievement Orientation by Family Size (Reissman Scale)	69
X	Socioeconomic Status and Achievement Orientation (Reissman Scale)	71
XI	Expected Occupational Mobility and Achievement Orientation by Social Class (Reissman Scale)	75
XII	Achievement Orientation and Respondent's Expected Occupation (Reissman Scale)	76

XIII	Gamma and Chi Square Values for the Relationship Between Social Class and Achievement Orientation by Mid-Semester Average (Rosen and Reissman Scales)	81
XIV	Gamma and Chi Square Values for the Relationship Between Social Class and Achievement Orientation by Family Size (Rosen and Reissman Scales)	82
XV	Gamma and Chi Square Values for the Relationship Between Social Class and Achievement Orientation by Eight Specified Variables (Rosen and Reissman Scales)	86-87
XVI	Gamma and Chi Square Values for the Relationship Between Expected Occupational Mobility and Achievement Orientation (Rosen and Reissman Scales)	89

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

The focus of this study is the relationship between social class and achievement orientation on the one hand, and achievement orientation and occupational plans on the other. For the purpose of the study, 310 Grade nine male students in three public junior high schools in Jasper Place were investigated. The achievement orientations of these respondents were measured by two different scales which previous researchers used and reported in the literature. Assuming the validity of the argument that one of these scales is biased in favor of the middle-class, the main question which this study attempts to answer is: What relationships may be found between the above noted variables when achievement orientation is measured by significantly different instruments.

The research problem and the significance of the study will be discussed in more detail following a brief review of the literature.

EARLY PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Upward social mobility is influenced not only by the structural conditions of society but also by the

personality characteristics of the individual. McClelland and his associates have identified the personality correlate of achievement as the "achievement motive."¹ Since the work of McClelland, et al. centers around this personality correlate of achievement, the importance of social and structural conditions of achievement is taken for granted. For present purposes we would like to review differences in the desire to excel among different segments of the population.

The writings of pioneer psychologists in this field indicate a "universal" desire or need for achievement. Henry A. Murray, for example, defines it as the need

. . . to overcome obstacles, to exercise power, to strive to do something difficult as well and as quickly as possible. (This is an elementary Ego need which alone may prompt any action or be fused with any other need.)²

Likewise, McClelland and his associates note that "everyone has the rudiments of an achievement motive."³

Murray and McClelland, et al. seem to agree that the strength of the need to achieve depends largely upon the socialization process to which one is subjected. On the basis of their research, McClelland, et al. explicitly note the association between achievement motivation and such

variables as independence training, conformity, morality and friendliness, and helpfulness and cleverness of parents.⁴

Elsewhere in the same reference they state that

. . . stronger achievement motives probably require for most (though not necessarily all) children some structuring of performance standards, some demands by the parents and the surrounding culture.⁵

In addition to the impact of social factors on the achievement motive, it is important to note the influence of the testing situation on this personality characteristic. In their experiments, McClelland, et al. have found that the conditions under which the test of achievement motivation is given influence the scores obtained by the respondents. The three main testing situations outlined in The Achievement Motive are the relaxed, neutral and achievement-oriented atmospheres. Each condition was created by a specific set of instructions which the administrator communicated to the respondents. For example, in order to obtain the achievement-oriented condition the administrator told the respondents that the test measured their level of intelligence and their potential for leadership.⁶

A similar observation concerning the influence of the testing situation on the motivation to achieve is reported by Elizabeth Douvan.⁷ She found that working and

middle class children differed significantly in achievement scores when the tests administered lacked any reward. However, when a ten dollar reward was offered to any student reaching a certain level of performance, the scores of the working class subjects increased appreciably while those of the middle class subjects stayed at their original level.

To summarize, it is held that the strength of the achievement motive is variable, depending on early socialization and training. Psychometric results reveal that achievement scores are influenced by the testing situation. As will be shown later, other conditions of measurement, such as the scale used, also influence scores on the achievement test.

SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH ON SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT

The mere presence of the achievement motive in any individual does not ensure that he will strive for success in socially approved ways. Bernard Rosen, for example, mentions that a person with high achievement motivation might be a criminal. For this reason, Rosen introduces a second element to what he calls the achievement syndrome. This element, which "define[s] and implement[s] achievement motivated behavior," is called achievement value orientation.⁸

Thus if an individual is motivated to become rich or wealthy, and if he holds the value orientations of the society, he will not strive to reach his goal in a criminal manner. Rosen mentions that in most personalities these two components of the achievement syndrome (meaning achievement motivation and value orientations) occur together. Accordingly, a person with a high value orientation tends to have the motivation to strive toward his goals.

Because of its direct relevance to the present research, Rosen's study will be discussed in some detail. Rosen hypothesizes that "social classes possess to a disparate extent [these] two components of . . . achievement orientation."⁹ This helps explain why "upward mobility is greater among members of the middle class [than it is among] those of the lower strata."¹⁰

Rosen used a Thematic Apperception Test developed by David McClelland and his associates to determine the achievement motivation of his subjects.¹¹ In this test the respondents were shown pictures and asked to tell a story about each one. The stories were then scored for evidence of achievement motivation.

The value orientations of the subjects were determined by a structured questionnaire which was patterned

after a publication by Clyde and Florence Kluckhohn.¹²

Rosen included in his questionnaire fourteen items which measured a person's value orientations in relation to three main areas, namely, activism-passivism, present-future, and individualistic-familistic orientation. A brief description of each of these areas follows.

I. Activistic-Passivistic Orientation

Activistic-passivistic orientation concerns the extent to which a society or sub-group encourages the individual to believe in the possibility of his manipulating the physical and social environment to his advantage.¹³

The passivist withdraws because he realizes that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to manipulate his environment to his advantage.¹⁴ The activist, on the other hand, sees the possibility of rising through various channels and surmounting the obstacles which might tend to impede upward mobility. The following items were used to determine this dimension:

1. All I want out of life in the way of a career is a secure, not too difficult job, with enough pay to afford a nice car and eventually a home of my own.
2. When a man is born the success he is going to have is already in the cards, so he might just as well accept it and not fight it.
3. Even though parents often seem too strict, when a person gets older he will realize it was beneficial.

4. If my parents told me to stop seeing a friend of my own sex, I'd see that friend anyway.

5. Parents seem to believe that you can't take the opinion of a teenager seriously.

II. Present-Future Orientation

A present oriented society stresses the importance of living in the present with an emphasis upon immediate gratification; a future oriented society urges the individual to believe that planning and present sacrifices are worthwhile, or morally obligated, in order to insure future gains.¹⁵

The future oriented individual adheres to the deferred gratification pattern of behavior as is emphasized by Schneider and Lysgaard.¹⁶ The present oriented individual, on the other hand, prefers to obtain immediate gratification and in so doing makes it difficult to obtain greater rewards in the future. It might be mentioned that present-future orientation can refer to a number of areas such as economics, education, sex, and violence. The following items were used to determine this dimension:

1. It's silly for a teenager to put money in a car when the money could be used to get started in business or for an education.

2. Education and learning are more important in determining a person's happiness than money and what it will buy.

3. Planning only makes a person unhappy since your plans hardly ever work out anyway.

4. Nowadays with world conditions the way they are, the wise person lives for today and lets tomorrow care for itself.

III. Familistic-Individualistic Orientation

This dimension

. . . concerns the relationship of the individual to his kin. One aspect of this orientation is the importance given to the maintenance of physical proximity to the family of orientation. In a familistically oriented society the individual is not urged, or not permitted, to acquire independence of family ties.¹⁷

It appears that Rosen's individualistic orientation is somewhat analogous to the one which is characteristic of upwardly mobile, unmarried career women in Evelyn Ellis' study.¹⁸ She stresses the importance of early primary group relations in determining whether the individual will strive for upward mobility or be content to remain stationary. For example, women who have had unsatisfactory primary group relations in childhood have a significantly higher rate of upward mobility than women who have had satisfactory primary group relationships. The following items were used by Rosen to determine this dimension:

1. Parents would be greatly upset if their son ended up doing factory work.

2. The best kind of job is one where you are part of an organization all working together, even if you don't get individual credit.

3. When the time comes for a boy to take a job, he should stay near his parents, even if it means giving up a good job.
4. Even when teenagers get married, their main loyalty is still to their mother and father.
5. Nothing in this life is worth the sacrifice of moving away from your parents.

In his study of 120 male sophomores in two public high schools in the New Haven area, Rosen found that both the achievement motivation and the value orientation scores were positively associated with social class. This lent support to his hypothesis and led to the conclusion that the psycho-cultural dimension was important in explaining the differential rates of upward mobility of the various classes.¹⁹

Other studies have reported findings similar to those presented by Rosen. Melvin L. Kohn found a significant difference between the values emphasized by middle and working class parents in socializing their children. While working class parents valued obedience, middle class parents valued consideration and self control.²⁰ The first tends toward what we call familistic orientation while consideration and self control tend to suggest that the child should be able to get along well with others. He is being prepared for a life away from his family.

Davis and Havighurst also found differences between middle and lower class parents with regard to the values emphasized in child-rearing. They found that "middle class parents place more emphasis on the early assumption of responsibility for the self and on individual achievement."²¹

Kahl makes a similar observation in his review of the literature on achievement. He says:

It is a reasonable assumption that families or cultural groups who stress achievement will give early independence training to their children, and that children who have had such training will grow up to stress achievement as adults. The causation is circular. Middle-class parents, and working-class parents who believe in getting ahead, probably give their children more independence training than working-class parents who believe in just getting by.²²

Barber caricatures the lower classes in the following manner:

Lower-class people . . . participate in fewer organized activities and know fewer people than do those in the other social classes. They are less often members of voluntary associations or civil defense organizations, and they visit fewer friends and acquaintances. They have less facility than middle-class people in reading and writing. They read fewer magazines and listen to the 'less serious' radio and television programmes. They know less about political issues and have less expressed interest in them. They are less critical of the sources

of the daily news. They are more timid about expressing their opinions to poll interviewers and more often give 'don't know' answers. They know less about such matters that concern their social and economic interests as income taxes, price controls, birth control, and consumers' co-operation. The lower classes have lower occupational aspirations as high-school students, they wish for more modest Christmas presents, and they tend to go into blind-alley jobs. They have lower expectations for future income and they are much less likely than people in the middle class to say that the future holds good opportunities for them to improve their occupational and economic position.²³

Nevertheless, Barber voices a word of caution to those who refer to the lower classes as being "apathetic," "submissive," or "withdrawn." He says, "We do not know precisely in what measure the attitudes of the lower-classes are rational adaptations to their objective situation, in what measure emotional or irrational responses."²⁴

Other researchers such as Robert E. Sears,²⁵ Mary S. Strong,²⁶ Richard Centres,²⁷ Herbert H. Hyman,²⁸ William H. Sewell, Archie O. Haller and Murray A. Straus,²⁹ and Leonard B. Siemens³⁰ have reported findings which support the view that the lower classes have substantially different value orientations from those of the middle classes.

There are, however, a number of researchers who challenge the unqualified conclusion that middle class

background is associated with a higher degree of achievement orientation than lower class background. One of the most important of these, for present purposes, is Leonard Reissman.³¹

The purpose of Reissman's study was to determine the nature of the relationship between social class and aspirations.³² In this effort he notes four major difficulties. First, there is some confusion regarding the definition of class. Second, in dealing with aspirations the reference is to a future time period which leads to problems of reliability. Third, the fact that "some may aspire to owning material goods, some to fame, or some to acceptance in the community"³³ is not taken into account. Interest has been focused upon generalizing for a group as a whole. Finally, aspirations are held with some reference to a social group and should be judged in such terms.

Reissman studied three groups: (1) Policemen, (2) Jaycees, and (3) Residents of Evanston. The third sample was subdivided into four groups: (1) old high achievers, (2) old low achievers, (3) young high achievers, and (4) young low achievers.

The study of aspirations was limited to a specifically occupational referent and, significantly, some of the

items used were quite similar to those used by Rosen. To obtain appropriate information, Reissman asked the following question:

Suppose you were offered an opportunity to make a substantial advance in a job or occupation. Place a check (✓) opposite each item in the following list to show how important it would be in stopping you from making that advance. (Assume that you are working in some job or occupation.)

	Might stop me from making a change	Would be a serious consider- ation but wouldn't stop me	Wouldn't matter at all
1. Endanger your health	_____	_____	_____
2. Leave your family for some time	_____	_____	_____
3. Move around the country a lot	_____	_____	_____
4. Leave your community	_____	_____	_____
5. Give up leisure time	_____	_____	_____
6. Keep quiet about your political views	_____	_____	_____
7. Keep quiet about your religious views	_____	_____	_____
8. Work harder than you did in the job you held previously	_____	_____	_____
9. Learn a new routine	_____	_____	_____

10. Take on more responsibility than you had in your previous job _____

For the older group of the Evanston sample, Reissman found a positive association between achievement and aspirations.³⁴ However, for the younger group he found that the low achievers had higher aspirations than the high achievers. He suggests that

. . . the explanation might be that the old high achievers have been so devoted to the pursuit of success that their orientation carries with it a momentum into the future even at their present age. For them it appears that the ethic of striving is never over, and the goal never won. The low achievers on the other hand, are relatively low aspiring. They have never been especially successful in the past and appear to be content with their present position in the future as well. The time for striving is over for them, if indeed, they were ever interested

For the younger men, unlike the older men, there is still time to achieve success. The low achievers apparently are sufficiently aware of the difference to be oriented in that direction.³⁵

Reissman argues that "if future occupational achievement were not important for them, then the [young] low achievers would not show such consistently higher aspirations."³⁶

A similar finding is reported by Straus whose study of 338 junior high school students shows that "deferment of aggressive, sexual, and consumption needs is unrelated to

socioeconomic status of the boy's family of orientation."³⁷ The same study also reveals a relationship between socioeconomic status and affiliative needs, but Straus suggests that the items by which this was measured had an inherent social class bias.

Thus, the "total D.G.P. [deferred gratification pattern] scale is . . . shown . . . to be unrelated to S.E.S. [socioeconomic status] ."³⁸

Parenthetically, it is interesting to note that Straus' conclusions are based on a study of high school students. Assuming that Straus' and Rosen's samples come from the same population, the apparent difference in the findings of these two authors may, at least in part, be a function of the different instruments used. Moreover, although Rosen and Reissman studied different populations (high school students by the former and working adults by the latter), the differences in their findings may also be related partly to differences in their instruments.

Robert K. Merton,³⁹ Alvin W. Rose,⁴⁰ and Charles McArthur⁴¹ also support the contention that members of various stratification levels share the same basic values.

Stephenson presents the problem in a similar manner to that in which it is presented here. He says that one

school of thought

. . . assumes that mobility orientation roughly follows class lines, so that the middle and upper classes are the strivers while the lower classes set a level of aspiration that is largely satisfied within the limits of their own stratum. This view implies that the very orientation of the lower strata prevents them from upward mobility, irrespective of the class distribution of mobility resources and skills. The other assumes that there is a somewhat similar mobility orientation throughout the stratification system, and that regardless of one's position in it, the orientation is toward commonly perceived and desired goals. This hypothesis places the emphasis upon unequal distribution of resources and skills in explaining class differences in upward mobility.⁴²

To summarize, it has been suggested that two types of findings have been reported in the literature on social class and achievement orientation. One of these claims that the middle classes are more achievement oriented than the lower classes. The other claims that the lower classes are as achievement oriented as the middle classes.

Several authors, notably Ephriam Mizruchi, have attempted to resolve this apparent contradiction in the literature. On the basis of a study done in the New York area in 1958 Mizruchi notes that both lower and middle class people are advancement oriented. However, whereas the former are success oriented the latter are achievement oriented.⁴³ For example, in response to the question, "Could you list, in

order of importance, those things which you believe to be signs of success in our society?" lower class people tended to state material-economic symbols such as job security, home ownership, and money as their first choice, whereas middle class people tended to state non-material-economic symbols such as education, many friends, and prestige.⁴⁴ There is no doubt that both of these groups have ambitions and goals but, as was suggested earlier in the discussion of Reissman, "some may aspire to owning material goods, some to fame, or some to acceptance in the community."⁴⁵

Hyman Rodman, in studying illegitimacy in the Caribbean social structure, has posited the existence of a lower-class value stretch by which he means

. . . that the lower class person, without abandoning the general values of the society, develops an alternative set of values The result is that the members of the lower-class, in many areas, have a wider range of values than others in the society. They share the values of the society with members of the other classes, but in addition they have stretched these values, or developed alternative values which help them to adjust to their deprived circumstances.⁴⁶

Rodman supports the idea suggested in this thesis that lower class people do not totally reject middle class values; rather, they have made an adjustment to their deprived position by adopting additional values which

typically do not characterize the middle class. Thus, if relieved of their deprived circumstances, they would conceivably operate on the basis of the same values as their middle class counterparts.

Several factors which seem to account for some of the variability in the relationship between social class and achievement orientation have been noted. The conditions under which the test is administered and the particular population studied are two of these. A third is the scale used to measure achievement orientation. In this study, by holding the first two factors constant, it was possible to study the effect of administering two different scales of achievement orientation.

ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION AND EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Implicit in any discussion of achievement orientation is the question of social mobility. Milton Gordon suggests that "the concept [of class] implies the possibility of at least a minimum of movement from one class to another, or, in other words, some vertical social mobility."⁴⁷ In the preceding discussion there is an intimation that socially mobile groups tend to be more achievement oriented than their non-mobile counterparts.

Rosen provides a clue to his views in this area when he says that "achievement motivation can be expressed through a wide range of behavior, some of which may not be conducive to social mobility in our society."⁴⁸ But, following Rosen, since achievement motivation and value orientation are likely to exist together, the person with high achievement value orientation will tend to be more mobile than the person with low achievement value orientation.

Indeed this point of view is supported by other authors. Evelyn Ellis has found that women with high achievement orientations tend to be more mobile than women with low achievement orientations.⁴⁹

Hyman also states that

. . . it is our assumption that an intervening variable mediating the relationship between low position and lack of upward mobility is a system of beliefs and values within the lower classes which in turn reduces the very voluntary actions which would ameliorate their low position.⁵⁰

In fairness to Hyman it should be mentioned that he also recognizes differential opportunity in the society. For example, higher education costs money which is more readily available to middle than to lower class people.

Merton, on the other hand, claims that lower class people have the same orientation as the middle classes. As

Stephenson notes, Merton "places the emphasis upon unequal distribution of resources and skills in explaining class differences in mobility."⁵¹

In a study done by Stephenson it was found that

. . . the mobility orientation pattern suggested is one in which aspirations are relatively unaffected by class, and hence, reflect the general cultural emphasis upon high goal orientations, while plans or expectations are more definitely class based and, hence, may reflect class differences in opportunity and general life chances.⁵²

Empey has provided a valuable insight by comparing the mobility aspirations of respondents from different social class backgrounds. He says that

. . . the relative positions of respondents should be taken into account, that is, some attention should be paid to the class level from which the individual begins in deciding whether or not he desires to get ahead.⁵³

His criticism becomes particularly relevant when we read studies such as the one done by Krauss in which people "were categorized according to their potential for mobility, as expressed in their plans for college, technical school, or no further education."⁵⁴ It is to be expected that middle class children will have higher absolute aspirations than lower class children because they are aware of more opportunities and have a greater possibility of realizing them.

However, the child whose father has not completed grade eight and who himself expects to finish high school might be relatively as high an aspirer as the child who expects to get a University degree when his father had two years of university.

Empey's research supported neither of the two positions as outlined by Hyman and Merton. He found that "While the lower class youngsters aspired to get ahead they aspired to occupations at different status levels than those from higher strata."⁵⁵

In this study concern is focused on the expected occupational mobility of the students using Empey's "relative" definition of occupational mobility. Specifically, we are interested in determining whether the type of scale used to measure achievement orientation influences the relationship between this variable and expected occupational mobility.

THE PROBLEM

With this discussion as a background the problem may now be stated in fuller detail. It should be mentioned first, however, that certain difficulties have been encountered because of the lack of congruence in the terminology of

various authors. Thus, while Rosen refers to achievement value orientation, Reissman discusses aspirations. Still another author (Stephenson⁵⁶), who appears to be dealing with the same concept, refers to it as mobility orientation. In the present study the term "achievement orientation" will be employed.

Contradictory findings have been noted in the literature on social class, achievement orientation and occupational mobility. Some authors have found that the middle classes are more achievement oriented than the lower classes while others have reported exactly opposite findings. Similarly, the evidence on the relationship between achievement orientation and occupational mobility is contradictory. Several important factors appear to account for variability in available evidence. These include the population studied, the definitions of social class and occupational mobility, and the type of scale used to measure achievement orientation. The present study is concerned with the impact of the third factor on the relationship between achievement orientation and each of social class and expected occupational mobility. The two scales selected for this purpose were presented in their entirety earlier in this chapter. They are also included in Appendices B and C respectively.

There are several reasons why the Rosen scale should produce higher correlations with the variables of social class and expected occupational mobility than the Reissman scale. First, the Rosen scale is more abstract in that it deals with activism-passivism, present-future, and familistic-individualistic orientations as ends in themselves, while the Reissman scale has an occupational referent.⁵⁷ Second, and closely related, is the fact that in the Reissman scale the respondent is asked to answer in terms of the sacrifices and inconveniences he would be willing to undergo in order to obtain the reward of substantial advancement in a job or occupation, while in the Rosen scale no such reward is offered. The positive effects of offering tangible rewards to the lower classes as discussed by Douvan have already been mentioned.⁵⁸

The problem, then, is that of finding out whether members of the various social classes and those with different mobility expectations have appreciably different achievement orientations or whether the results obtained depend on the type of scale used to measure achievement orientation. Two hypotheses, based on the preceding discussion, are presented to test these relationships:

Hypothesis 1: The magnitude of the relationship between social class and achievement orientation will be considerably greater when the Rosen scale is used than when the Reissman scale is used in measuring the latter variable.

Hypothesis 2: The magnitude of the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation, with social class controlled, will be considerably greater when the Rosen scale is used than when the Reissman scale is used in measuring the latter variable.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The main significance of this study is that it attempts to provide further clarification of a problem on which apparently contradictory findings have been presented in the literature. In a field such as Sociology, where very few definite statements can be made, it is important to do studies of this nature in order to add some precision to our predictions. In this study we are interested in delineating several different dimensions of achievement orientation. They are those of reward - no reward and abstract - specific. By doing studies of this nature it is possible to predict more accurately the relationships which will be obtained when certain dimensions are studied.

The study also sheds some light on the widely held view that the lower classes are apathetic, submissive, and withdrawn.⁵⁹ Barber's note of caution has already been

mentioned as has Reissman's. Support for hypothesis 1 would suggest that the lower classes are achievement oriented when they perceive an opportunity to realize goals which are within their reach, taking into consideration their limited social and material resources. Support for hypothesis 2 would suggest that those who do not expect to be mobile are achievement oriented, when they perceive the same type of opportunity.

PLAN OF THE THESIS

Chapter II is a report of the methodology of the study. In Chapter III the data dealing with the Rosen scale of achievement and the variables of social class and expected occupational mobility are presented. Chapter IV deals with the same relationships for the Reissman achievement scale. Chapter V is a comparison of the results reported in Chapters III and IV. Also, in Chapter V the hypotheses are tested. In Chapter VI the thesis is summarized and the implications are discussed.

FOOTNOTES

¹David M. McClelland, et al., The Achievement Motive (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953).

²Henry A. Murray, "Types of Human Needs," in David M. McClelland, Studies in Motivation (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955), pp. 63-70.

³McClelland, et al., op. cit., p. 78.

⁴Ibid., pp. 275-318.

⁵Ibid., p. 78.

⁶Ibid., pp. 139-160.

⁷Elizabeth Douvan, "Social Status and Success Strivings," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), pp. 219-223.

⁸Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, XXI (April, 1956), p. 204.

⁹Ibid., p. 205.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 203.

¹¹McClelland, et al., op. cit.

¹²C. Kluckhohn and F. Kluckhohn, "American Culture: Generalized Orientations and Class Patterns" in Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture, ed. L. Bryson, et al., Harper and Bros., 1947, as quoted in Rosen, op. cit., p. 207.

¹³Rosen, op. cit., p. 207.

¹⁴Genevieve Knupfer, "Portrait of the Underdog," Public Opinion Quarterly, XI (Spring, 1947), p. 104.

¹⁵Rosen, op. cit., p. 208.

¹⁶L. Schneider and S. Lysgaard, "The Deferred Gratification Pattern: A Preliminary Study," American Sociological Review, XVIII (April, 1953), pp. 142-150.

¹⁷Rosen, op. cit., p. 208.

¹⁸Evelyn Ellis, "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, XVII (October, 1953), pp. 558-563.

¹⁹It should be mentioned that Rosen administered both his achievement motivation and value orientation tests under what may be termed relaxed conditions. This might help in explaining the type of relationships obtained.

²⁰Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (January, 1959), p. 340.

²¹Allison Davis and Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Child Rearing," American Sociological Review, XI (December, 1946), p. 707.

²²Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1957), p. 292.

²³Bernard Barber, Social Stratification (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957), p. 308.

²⁴Ibid., p. 309.

²⁵Robert R. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing (Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957), pp. 427-436.

²⁶Mary S. Strong, "Social Class and Levels of Aspiration Among Selected Alberta High School Students," (unpublished Master's thesis, Dept. of Sociology, University of Alberta, 1963), p. 90.

²⁷Richard Centres, "Children of the New Deal: Social Stratification and Adolescent Attitudes," in R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, Class, Status, and Power (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1964), pp. 359-370.

²⁸Herbert H. Hyman, "The Value Systems of the Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, Class, Status, and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 488-499.

²⁹William H. Sewell, Archie O. Haller, and Murray A. Straus, "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," American Sociological Review, XXII (February, 1957), pp. 67-73.

³⁰Leonard B. Siemens, The Influence of Selected Family Factors on the Educational and Occupational Aspirations of High School Boys and Girls (Winnipeg, Manitoba: Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics, 1965).

³¹Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, XVIII (June, 1953), pp. 233-242.

³²Ibid., p. 233.

³³Ibid., p. 234.

³⁴Reissman's use of the term aspiration here is synonymous with Rosen's use of the term achievement value orientation. Perhaps one reason why Reissman did not use the latter term is because he has already introduced the term achievement in discussing old and young achievers.

³⁵Reissman, op. cit., pp. 240-241.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 240-241.

³⁷Murray A. Straus, "Deferred Gratification, Social Class, and the Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), p. 331.

³⁸Ibid., p. 331.

³⁹Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie," in Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1964), Chapter IV.

⁴⁰Alvin W. Rose, "A Socio-Psychological Analysis of the Ambition Patterns of a Sample of Industrial Workers," (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Dept. of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1946), as quoted in Reissman, op. cit., p. 235.

⁴¹Charles McArthur, "Personality Differences Between Middle and Upper Classes," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, L (1955), pp. 247-258 as quoted in S. M. Lipset and R. Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), pp. 245-246.

⁴²Richard M. Stephenson, "Mobility Orientation and Stratification of 1,000 Ninth Graders," American Sociological Review, XXII (April, 1957), p. 204.

⁴³E. Mizruchi, Success and Opportunity (New York: The Free Press, 1964), Chapter IV.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 72.

⁴⁵Reissman, op. cit., p. 234.

⁴⁶Hyman Rodman, "The Lower-Class Value Stretch," Social Forces, XLII (December, 1963), p. 209.

⁴⁷Milton M. Gordon, Social Class in American Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), p. 3.

⁴⁸Rosen, op. cit., p. 206.

⁴⁹Ellis, op. cit.

⁵⁰Hyman, op. cit., p. 488, (*Italics in original*).

⁵¹Stephenson, op. cit., p. 204.

⁵²Ibid., p. 212.

⁵³LaMar T. Empey, "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), p. 704.

⁵⁴Irving Krauss, "Sources of Educational Aspirations Among Working Class Youth," American Sociological Review, XXIX (December, 1964), pp. 867-868.

⁵⁵Empey, op. cit., pp. 708-709.

⁵⁶Stephenson, op. cit.

⁵⁷Mizruchi found, for example, that job security was an important indicator of success for the lower classes. Obviously their jobs are important to them. Mizruchi, op. cit., p. 72.

⁵⁸Douvan, loc. cit.

⁵⁹Barber, loc. cit.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

In order to test the hypotheses listed in Chapter I a questionnaire was constructed and administered to a sample of Grade nine boys in the City of Edmonton. The questionnaire included items on father's occupation and level of education, boys' expected and ideal occupations, and achievement orientation. Information was also obtained on family size, school grades, expected occupation of best friend, and future educational plans.

The questionnaire was pre-tested on a class of 35 Grade nine boys at one of the schools. Questionnaires were not administered to these boys in the final study. On the basis of the pre-test, items were added on father's education, reasons for not going to university, and mid-semester average. Several other questions, the interpretations of which the respondents found difficult or confusing, were reworded and clarified.

The final form of the questionnaire was administered to all boys who were present on the days of visitation (April 28 to May 3, 1967) at the three junior high schools

under the Edmonton Public School Board administration in Jasper Place. The total number of questionnaires distributed was 310. Of these nine were discarded because they were incomplete, leaving a total of 301 questionnaires for analysis.

In the remainder of this chapter the discussion will focus on the following aspects of methodology: (1) operationalization of the variables, (2) validity and reliability of the instruments, (3) the population and sample studied, (4) the test statistics employed in the analysis of data, (5) the assumptions of the study, (6) the delimitations of the study, and (7) the limitations of the study.

OPERATIONALIZING THE VARIABLES

The three main variables to be considered are social class, achievement orientation, and expected occupational mobility.

Social Class:

The class position of each respondent was determined by father's occupation. Occupations were ranked on the basis of a detailed scale which was published by the United States Bureau of the Census.¹ On the basis of father's occupation respondents were classified under the following categories:

(1) Professional, technical and kindred workers, (2) Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm, (3) Clerical, sales, and kindred workers, (4) Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers, (5) Operatives, and kindred workers, (6) Service Workers, including private household, and (7) Laborers, except farm and mine. These occupational categories were subsequently reduced to a trichotomy, with the first two categories defined as upper class, the second two as middle class, and the last three as lower class. There are several reasons for this choice of breaking points.

First, members of the professional and managerial classes occupy positions which usually require high education and extensive training. Members of the clerical and craftsmen classes require some level of skill and/or training but usually it can be provided on the job within a period of a year or less. Members of the operative, service, and laboring classes are for the most part unskilled and require little, if any, on or off the job training.

A second justification for these breaking points is that another scale constructed by Bernard R. Blishen tends to combine these groups in a similar manner.² For example, in his second class Blishen has engineers, chemists, and managers. In his fourth class he has bookkeepers, cashiers,

office clerks, foremen, and railway brakemen. In his sixth class he has truck drivers, waiters, elevator tenders, and laborers. These combinations agree with the classification used in this study.

A third justification is that the United States Bureau of the Census scale gives specific scores for occupations. There is considerable overlap here so that while the score of a clergyman in Class 1 is 67, that of a wholesale trade manager in Class 2 is 90. Similarly, while a salesman in retail trades scores 61, a transportation foreman in Class 4 scores 84. A similar trend appears for Classes 4, 5 and 6.

On the basis of these arguments the author claims that the trichotomy of upper, middle, and lower class, represents an ordinal ranking.

Data were also collected on the father's education level. A trichotomy was made by classifying fathers in the following manner: (1) those who had not completed high school, (2) those who had graduated from high school or had gone to trade school, and (3) those who had some university or had earned a university degree.

Achievement Orientation:

Achievement orientations were determined by two scales used by Rosen³ and Reissman⁴ which appear in appendices B and C respectively.

Since Reissman's scale was originally administered to adults, slight modifications had to be effected in order to make it appropriate for administration to Grade nine boys. The modified form is presented in appendix C.

Both the Rosen and Reissman scales were scored by assigning a value of -1 to a non-achievement oriented response and a value of +1 to an achievement oriented response. Scores for each individual on each scale were then obtained by summing these values. The scores ranged from -14 to +14 on the Rosen scale and from -10 to +10 on the Reissman scale. The cutting points were arbitrarily set to divide the respondents into three sub-groups. On the Rosen scale scores ranged from -14 to 0 for low achievement orientation, from +2 to +6 for medium achievement orientation, and from +8 to +14 for high achievement orientation. On the Reissman scale scores ranged from -10 to -4 for low achievement orientation, from -2 to +2 for medium achievement orientation, and from +4 to +10 for high achievement orientation. According to the Rosen scale 65 subjects were

classified as low, 177 as medium and 59 as high. In comparison, the Reissman scale showed that 82 respondents were classified as low, 162 as medium, and 57 as high.

Expected Occupational Mobility:

Because the respondents have not yet located themselves in the occupational structure it is only possible to deal with their expected occupations. This should be kept in mind when the terms mobile and non-mobile are discussed.

In this study mobile subjects are those who expect to move at least one rank above their father's on the previously noted seven rank scale. It might be mentioned that this is a relative definition of mobility rather than an absolute one. For example, a person whose father is a laborer and who, himself, expects to be a service worker, is mobile. This definition corresponds with Empey's relative definition of mobility.

One problem associated with the use of this measure is whether or not students differentiate between aspirations and expectations.⁵ Stephenson suggests that this problem can be overcome by asking students not only what occupation they expect to be in when they are 25 years old but also what they would like to do if they could do what they really wanted to. In this study, question 11 asked "What occupation or profession

do you expect to be in when you are 25 years old?" Then there was a brief comment:

In the last question you indicated what you actually plan to do. However, often times we have to plan to do things we would not do if circumstances were different. Therefore, we would like you to consider the following question.

Question 12 asked "If you could do what you really wanted to do, what occupation would you like to be in when you are 25 years old?" Some students, after having read the comment and question 12, erased their original answer to question 11 and substituted their expectations. When occupational preference and expectations were trichotomized and correlated a gamma of .85 was obtained. This suggests that the respondents did not differentiate between expected and preferred occupations. However, a qualification should be introduced because a respondent who would like to be a railroad brakeman (class 5) but who expected to be a laborer (class 7), for example, would appear consistent on his expected and preferred occupations since both fall into the low class category on the three point scale. This helps explain the high correlation.⁶

Data on other variables such as family size, school grades, high school programme, best friend's occupation, and

university plans, were also obtained. These are, for the most part, direct and require no further explanation. All of the questions asked are contained in the questionnaire in appendix A.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Since both of the scales of achievement orientation used in this study have been used by previous researchers in the area, no formal tests for validity and reliability were conducted. The primary concern here is whether these two scales with the specific characteristics attributed to them, would relate differently to the variables of social class and expected occupational mobility.

It might seem contradictory to claim reliability and validity for two scales which, when correlated, produce a gamma of .24. But the main point emphasized in this study is that these two scales seem to tap different dimensions of achievement orientation.

Occupation is a widely used indicator of social class and for this reason only a short space will be devoted to justifying its use. Kahl says that

. . . A man's occupation is the source of his income, which in turn provides the style of life that serves as one of the major clues used by his neighbors in making their evaluations.

But occupation stands for more than merely a certain level of income. It indicates a man's education; it suggests the type of associates he comes into contact with on the job; it tells something of the contribution he makes to community welfare; it hints at the degree of his authority over other people.⁷

The criticism of using occupation as an indicator is that children tend to camouflage their father's occupations and make them appear higher than they really are. For example, a respondent whose father is a garbage collector might report his father's occupation as sanitary engineer or, more troublesome still for our purposes, engineer. Against this possibility we have no control except for the fact that father's occupation has been combined with father's education to produce a measure of socioeconomic status.

Finally, with regard to the variable of expected occupational mobility the expected occupation of the respondent has been used rather than his preferred occupation. Stephenson's arguments in favor of this definition have already been discussed.⁸ Expected intergenerational rank movement between the seven classes on the United States Bureau of the Census scale was used as the criterion of mobility in this study. A respondent was defined as mobile if his expected occupation was one or more ranks above that of his father and as non-mobile if his expected occupation was within or below

the rank of his father. This classification produces a gamma of .62 when correlated with the students' own perceptions of mobility in terms of whether they expect to be above, below, or at about the same occupational level as their fathers. When rank mobility is correlated with score mobility, as measured on the 99 point scale, a gamma of .92 is obtained. This provides some assurance that the indicator used is valid and reliable.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE STUDIED

Ideally the respondents for this study should include all Grade nine boys in the schools of the city of Edmonton.⁹ However, this was not possible because of the author's limited resources. For this reason it was decided to study the boys in the three junior high schools under the Edmonton Public School Board administration in Jasper Place. Until several years ago Jasper Place was an independent town and there is some basis for assuming that it has a population which is somewhat representative of that of Edmonton in general.

The schools chosen had a total enrollment of about 350 Grade nine boys. Thirty five of these were used for the pre-test, leaving a total of about 315 for the final study.

The questionnaire was administered to all boys present on the days from April 28 to May 2, 1967, when the schools were visited.

The questionnaire was administered under slightly different conditions in the three schools. At one of the schools the researcher did the administration himself. In the second school the questionnaire was administered by the teacher with the researcher visiting each classroom to distribute the papers and give instructions. In the third school the questionnaire was administered exclusively by the teachers. Because of the self-explanatory nature of the instrument it is assumed that these variations in administration did not have a significant influence on the results. This assumption is legitimated somewhat when averages on both scales for each of the three schools are computed. On the Rosen scale the averages for the schools were 2.0, 1.9, and 2.1, respectively, while on the Reissman scale they are 2.0, 2.3, and 2.0. These averages do not vary widely enough to suggest that the method of administration affected the results.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this research chi square is used as a test of significance, with .05 accepted as the level of significance.

Gamma is computed as a measure of association. This statistic is appropriate for ascertaining the degree of association between ordinal variables. Also, it has the proportional reduction in error characteristic discussed in a recent article by Herbert Costner.¹⁰ This allows us to conclude, for example, that when a gamma of .45 is obtained the proportional improvement in predicting the results on the dependent variable is .45 greater when the independent variable is used than when it is not used. This makes gamma particularly valuable for interpretation of results.

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The main assumptions made in this study are:

1. that Grade nine boys know the occupation in which they expect to be working when they are about 25 years old;
2. that what these boys say has some relevance to what they do;
3. that the Grade nine boys studied are somewhat representative of the population of Grade nine boys in the city of Edmonton.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was delimited to Grade nine male students attending the three junior high schools in Jasper Place under

the administration of the Edmonton Public School Board. Data were collected at one point in time, namely April 28 to May 2, 1967. The data available are those collected in the questionnaire in Appendix A and the boundaries set on the analysis of these data were determined by the I.B.M. programme used.¹¹

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One of the major limitations of this study is that certain types of data such as father's income, ethnic and religious background, and mother's occupation and education which could have been introduced as control variables could not be collected in a school setting because the Edmonton Public School Board has had complaints from parents about previous studies which collected such information.

The sample places a second limitation on the study because it is not necessarily statistically representative of the population of Grade nine boys in the city of Edmonton.

SUMMARY

The three main variables used in the study are social class, achievement orientation, and expected occupational mobility. The social class of the respondents was determined by ranking the stated occupation of the father

on the United States Bureau of the Census scale. Achievement orientation was measured by two scales, one of which views achievement orientation as being intrinsically rewarding while the other views it as being instrumental in the acquisition of extrinsic rewards. Finally, expected occupational mobility was determined by whether or not the students expected to rise one or more ranks above the occupation held by their fathers on the United States Bureau of the Census scale.

The validity and the reliability of the instruments which were used to determine social class position and achievement orientation were deduced from an examination of the relevant literature. Further, two separate measures of expected occupational mobility obtained by this research correlated highly with the above noted measure (based on expected inter-rank mobility). This provided some assurance that the indicator used was valid and reliable.

The statistics used in analyzing the data were indicated. Gamma was used as a measure of association while chi square was used as a test of significance. The level of significance was set at .05.

Finally, some of the main assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study have been stated. One of the

more serious limitations was that the sample was not necessarily representative of that of Edmonton, or even Jasper Place, because it was not randomly chosen.

FOOTNOTES

¹United States, Bureau of the Census, Methodology and Scores of Socioeconomic Status, Working Paper Number 15, United States Department of Commerce, 1960.

²Bernard R. Blishen, "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale," in Bernard R. Blishen, et al., Canadian Society (New York: The Free Press, Inc., 1961), pp. 477-485.

³Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, XXI (April, 1956), p. 204.

⁴Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, XVIII (June, 1953), pp. 233-242.

⁵Richard M. Stephenson, "Mobility Orientation and Stratification of 1,000 Ninth Graders," American Sociological Review, XXII (April, 1957), pp. 204-214. Kuvlesky and Bealer make a similar criticism to the one mentioned and suggest that the focus should be on expectations rather than aspirations. W.P. Kuvlesky and C.B. Bealer, "A Clarification of the Concept 'Occupational Choice'," Rural Sociology, XXXI (September, 1966), pp. 273-274.

⁶Two other measures of mobility, which were used to establish the validity of the one mentioned above, were obtained. The detailed occupational scores on the United States Census scale were used to estimate mobility in a manner somewhat consistent with that used in a study done by Evelyn Ellis. Upwardly mobile respondents were those whose expected occupation score on a 99 point scale was 15 or more above that of their father, while non-mobile subjects were those whose score was less than 15 points above that of their father. See Evelyn Ellis, "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, XVII (October, 1953), p. 559.

Each respondent was also asked "When you have settled down in your chosen occupation do you expect to be:

(1) above the occupational level of your father, (2) at about the same level as your father, or (3) below the occupational level of your father?" This was a subjective measure of expected occupational mobility. Those giving a 1 response were classified as mobile while those answering 2 or 3 were non-mobile.

These additional measures of expected occupational mobility were used in obtaining validity and reliability estimates.

⁷Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1953), p. 53.

⁸See footnote 5.

⁹Ninth graders were chosen because at this level students must start to think about the programme they will take in high school in order to be prepared for what they want to do later in life. Stephenson chose ninth graders for the same reason. Also, most students are below the age of 16 in this grade and thus we do not get the problem of selective withdrawal. Stephenson, op. cit., p. 206. Males have been chosen because their occupational expectations are more comparable with those of their fathers'.

¹⁰Herbert L. Costner, "Criteria for Measures of Association," American Sociological Review, XXX (June, 1965), pp. 341-353.

¹¹The programme used was prepared by George A. Miller as a modification of two earlier programmes prepared at the University of Washington -- XM02 prepared by Dr. David Bakher of the Research Computer Laboratory, and XM06 prepared by Thomas Steinburn and Judith Wilks of the Sociology Department. The data were processed by an I.B.M. 7040 computer.

CHAPTER III

SOCIAL CLASS, EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: THE ROSEN SCALE

This chapter reports the results of the section of the study which deals with the relationship between achievement orientation, as measured by the Rosen scale, and each of social class and expected occupational mobility. Tables are presented for the "uncontrolled" relationships as well as for those where family size, mid-semester average, and father's education were held constant.¹ Controls for other variables such as university plans and aspirations, best friend's expected occupation, respondent's occupational preference, and parental occupational choice were also introduced.² Detailed tables for these relationships are not included but gamma and chi square results for them are presented in Chapter V.

SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: THE ROSEN SCALE

In Table I the relationship between social class and achievement orientation is shown. The table shows that there is some moderate relationship between these two variables (Gamma = + .31). Whereas 28 per cent of those in

the lower class have low achievement orientation only 16 per cent of those in the upper class appear low on achievement orientation. Also, whereas only four per cent of the lower class respondents have high achievement orientation 27 per cent of those in the upper class fall in this category. The relationship discussed is significant at the .01 level. This result is similar to those reported by Bernard C. Rosen,³ L. Schneider and S. Lysgaard,⁴ and Melvin Kohn.⁵

TABLE I
SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION
(ROSEN SCALE)

<u>Achievement Orientation</u>	<u>Social Class</u>		
	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>Upper</u>
	%	%	%
Low	28	18	16
Medium	68	59	57
High	<u>04</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>27</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	74	114	90

Chi square = 16.7 ($P < .01$) Gamma = + .31

Table II shows the effect of introducing the control variable of mid-semester grade average. On the basis of this variable respondents were divided into the three categories of poor performers, average performers, and high performers. Poor performers were those with averages from 20 to 49 (less than a passing average); average performers were those with averages from 50 to 69; and high performers were those with averages from 70 to 100. For the poor performers the relationship between class and achievement orientation is very low ($\Gamma = + .08$); chi square is not significant. For the average performers the magnitude of the relationships is $+.34$ and chi square is significant. Finally, for the high performers the relationship is $+.30$ but the chi square does not reach significance at the level adopted in this study ($.05$). Caution is suggested in interpreting the last relationship because of the small N involved.

These results indicate that for students who get less than a passing average in school, social class membership does not correlate highly with achievement orientation. However, for the average and high performers social class and achievement orientation are more highly correlated.

TABLE II

SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION BY MID-
SEMESTER AVERAGE (ROSEN SCALE)

Achievement Orientation of <u>Poor Performers</u>	<u>Social Class</u>		
	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>Upper</u>
	%	%	%
Low	35	25	39
Medium	60	61	50
High	<u>05</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	37	36	18

Chi square = 16.7 (P < .01) Gamma = +.08

Achievement Orientation of <u>Average Performers</u>			
Low	23	16	09
Medium	73	57	62
High	<u>04</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>29</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	30	67	58

Chi square = 10.4 (P < .05) Gamma = +.34

Achievement Orientation of <u>High Performers</u>			
Low	00	11	08
Medium	100	56	54
High	<u>00</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>38</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	4	9	13

Chi square = 3.1 (P < .70) Gamma = +.30

Table III reports the results of controlling for family size. In this table large families are those with six or more children; average families are those with three to five children; and small families are those with one or two children. For large families the relationship between social class and achievement orientation is very low ($\text{Gamma} = +.02$). However, in observing the percentages we notice that only six per cent of those from the lower class have high achievement orientations as compared with 25 per cent from the upper class. For average sized families the relationship between class and achievement orientation is $+.44$ and chi square is significant. Finally, for small families a gamma of $+.16$ is obtained. In this table no consistent trend, such as the one found in the preceding table, was observed. However, there is some basis for arguing that for average and large families there is a higher relationship between social class and achievement orientation than there is for small families.

This conclusion was also reached by Rosen when he studied the influence of several demographic factors on the development of achievement motivation.⁶ He found that, regardless of social class, membership in small families was particularly conducive to the development of high achievement

TABLE III

SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION BY FAMILY SIZE (ROSEN SCALE)

Achievement Orientation in <u>Small Families</u>	<u>Social Class</u>		
	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>Upper</u>
	%	%	%
Low	06	15	21
Medium	88	58	54
High	<u>06</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>25</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	17	26	28

Chi square = 6.4 ($P < .20$) Gamma = +.02

Achievement Orientation in <u>Average Families</u>				
Low	37	21	11	
Medium	60	55	58	
High	<u>03</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>31</u>	
Total %	100	100	100	
Total N	38	67	55	

Chi square = 16.1 ($P < .01$) Gamma = +.44

Achievement Orientation in <u>Large Families</u>				
Low	32	14	29	
Medium	63	71	71	
High	<u>05</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>00</u>	
Total %	100	100	100	
Total N	19	21	7	

Chi square = 3.1 ($P < .70$) Gamma = +.16

motivation. However, he found that the relationship was stronger for the middle than for the lower class. He explains this by suggesting that fathers in small families are less dominant. Also, he notes that

the achievement-oriented values of parents of small families and their recognition of the importance of self-reliant mastery for advancement in our competitive society will cause them to urge the child to be self-reliant in situations where he competes with standards of excellence.⁷

Our finding for small families is similar to that reported by Rosen. We found that when family size was small the relationship between social class and achievement orientation was minimal ($\text{Gamma} = +.02$).

Occupation is a widely used indicator of social class but it is preferable to incorporate other indicators to improve the precision of the measure. We have already mentioned the problems involved when children camouflage their fathers' occupations and make them appear higher than they are. For this reason it was decided to take all respondents who reported their fathers' occupation and education consistently as high, medium, or low and see how they related to the variable of achievement orientation. There were 58 children who reported both their fathers' occupation and education as low; 27 reported both as medium; and 28 reported

both as high. Using occupation and education as a measure of socioeconomic status and cross tabulating this with achievement orientation, as is done in Table IV, a gamma of +.55, which is significant at the acceptance level, is obtained. This is a substantial improvement over occupation alone as an indicator of class and it suggests that if the indicators used were more precise, much higher relationships could be obtained controlling for variables such as academic performance and family size.

TABLE IV
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION
(ROSEN SCALE)

<u>Achievement Orientation</u>	<u>Socioeconomic Status*</u>		
	<u>Lower</u> %	<u>Middle</u> %	<u>Upper</u> %
Low	28	19	07
Medium	67	70	61
High	<u>05</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>32</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	58	27	28
<hr/> Chi square = 14.2 (P < .01) Gamma = +.55 <hr/>			

*It should be noted that this cross tabulation of achievement orientation with socioeconomic status includes only those who reported both their fathers' occupation and education consistently as high, medium, or low. This accounts for the small total number of respondents.

Summary:

In this section it has been shown that there is a moderate relationship between social class and achievement orientation when no controls are introduced ($\text{Gamma} = +.31$). Introducing the control variable of mid-semester average produced an interesting result. It was found that for low performers social class and achievement orientation were minimally related ($\text{Gamma} = +.08$). However, for the average and high performers the relationship was approximately the same as that observed in the "uncontrolled" relationship. When family size was introduced as a control variable it was found that for those from small families the relationship between social class and achievement orientation was minimal ($\text{Gamma} = +.02$). For those from average sized families the relationship was $+.44$ and for those from large families it was $+.16$. These results suggest that both of these variables are important ones to consider in studying the relationship between social class and achievement orientation. The results which have been reported in this section are somewhat similar to those reported by authors such as Rosen, Davis and Havighurst, and Ellis.

EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION:
THE ROSEN SCALE

In studying the relationship between occupational mobility and achievement orientation it is necessary to control for social class because if this is not done the relationship will be seriously distorted by the inclusion of the upper class subjects, many of whom cannot appear to be mobile because of the inter-rank definition of mobility used in this study. Table V shows that for lower class respondents the relationship between expected mobility and achievement orientation is $+.34$. For the middle class the relationship is $+.29$. In studying the upper class the relationship is negative because of the definition of mobility which was used. For this reason this part of the table is not relevant for present purposes. The two positive relationships for the lower and middle classes, however, indicate that there is a tendency for mobile subjects to be more achievement oriented than their non-mobile counterparts.

By observing the percentages in the body of the table we can see the effect of social class on the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation. For the lower class the percentages of

TABLE V

EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT
ORIENTATION BY SOCIAL CLASS (ROSEN SCALE)

Achievement Orientation of the Lower Class	<u>Expected Occupational Mobility</u>	
	<u>Non-Mobile</u> %	<u>Mobile</u> %
Low	46	24
Medium	46	72
High	<u>08</u>	<u>04</u>
Total %	100	100
Total N	13	55

Chi square = 3.4 (P < .20) Gamma = +.34

Achievement Orientation of the Middle Class		
Low	27	14
Medium	54	58
High	<u>19</u>	<u>28</u>
Total %	100	100
Total N	37	64

Chi square = 3.0 (P < .30) Gamma = +.29

Achievement Orientation of the Upper Class		
Low	13	19
Medium	55	62
High	<u>32</u>	<u>19</u>
Total %	100	100
Total N	47	37

Chi square = 2.0 (P < .50) Gamma = -.27

non-mobile and mobile subjects who have high achievement orientation are eight per cent and four per cent, respectively. For the middle class these percentages are 19 per cent and 28 per cent, respectively. When we observe those with low achievement orientations we find the percentages for the non-mobile and mobile respondents from the lower class to be 46 per cent and 24 per cent as compared with 27 per cent and 14 per cent for the middle class. These figures suggest that social class has a patterned influence on the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation. As we move from the lower class to the middle class the percentage of those with high achievement orientation rises.

The relative definition of mobility suggested by Empey⁸ was used in the immediately preceding table. According to it a person is defined as mobile if he expects his chosen occupation to be one or more ranks above the occupation held by his father. However, some of the studies which were reviewed in Chapter I --- particularly the one by Irving Krauss --- dealt with mobility in terms of the absolute level of respondents' occupational expectation level. With the data available it was possible for us to study the extent to which achievement orientation correlated with respondents'

expected occupation. No controls were introduced in this analysis because the results were not affected by the problems of definition as they were in Table V.

Table VI shows that there is a tendency for those who have higher occupational expectations to have higher achievement orientations ($\text{Gamma} = +.23$). For those with low achievement orientation 27 per cent have low occupational expectations as compared with 17 percent who have high occupational expectations. For those with high achievement orientation these figures are somewhat reversed. If, as some researchers maintain, the absolute level of the respondents' occupational expectation is interpreted as a measure of mobility the positive relationship, which was found using a relative measure, is still obtained.

Summary:

These data on achievement orientation and expected occupational mobility, both relative and absolute, support the contention of Rosen and others that mobile people tend to have higher achievement orientations than those who are not mobile. Using the relative definition we found that the relationships for the lower and middle class subjects were $+.34$ and $+.29$, respectively. The effect of social class position were evident when the percentages in the body of the

table were studied. As we moved from the lower to the middle class the percentage of those with high achievement orientations increased. Using the absolute definition of mobility we again noticed a tendency for those who had higher occupational expectations to have higher achievement orientations (Gamma = +.23).

TABLE VI

ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION AND RESPONDENT'S EXPECTED
OCCUPATION (ROSEN SCALE)

<u>Achievement Orientation</u>	<u>Respondent's Expected Occupation</u>		
	<u>Low</u> %	<u>Medium</u> %	<u>High</u> %
Low	27	32	17
Medium	56	52	60
High	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>23</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	30	73	170
<hr/> Chi square = 7.7 (P < .10) Gamma = +.23 <hr/>			

SUMMARY

In the first half of this chapter achievement orientation as measured by the Rosen Scale was related to social class. A moderately high relationship was observed between these variables (Gamma = +.31). Controlling for family size and mid-semester grade average produced no

substantial change in the direction of the relationship, except for the categories of family size small and grades low. These results have been discussed. In the second half of the chapter the Rosen measure of achievement was correlated with expected occupational mobility, controlling for social class. For lower and middle class subjects the relationship was moderately high. The negative relationship which obtained when the upper class respondents were studied has been explained. In addition to this the absolute level of respondent's occupational expectation was found to be correlated with achievement orientation.

The general trend of the data in this chapter is in the direction predicted in the two hypotheses. In the next chapter the same type of analysis is presented relating achievement orientation as measured by the Reissman scale to each of social class and expected occupational mobility. In Chapter V the results of Chapters III and IV will be compared.

FOOTNOTES

¹Two articles published by Rosen suggested that academic grade average and family size were important variables mediating the relationship between social class and achievement orientation. For this reason these variables were given more attention than some of the others. The importance of grades is discussed in Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, XXI (April, 1956), pp. 203-211. The importance of family size is discussed in Bernard C. Rosen, "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation," American Sociological Review, XXVI (August, 1961), pp. 574-585. Education was used as a control variable in order to combine it with occupation to get a measure of socioeconomic status.

²Studies of most of these variables which have been reported in the literature have shown that they are related to social class and/or achievement orientation. For example, Alexander and Campbell report that the educational aspirations of students are influenced by those of their best friends. E. Norman Alexander and Ernest Q. Campbell, "Peer Influences on Adolescent Educational Aspirations and Attainments," American Sociological Review, XXIX (December, 1964), pp. 560-575. Rosen and D'Andrade have shown that the expectations which parents set for their children are related to level of performance. For this reason we introduced the control on parental occupational choice. Bernard C. Rosen, and Roy D'Andrade, "The Psychosocial Origins of Achievement Motivation," Sociometry, XXII (March, 1959), pp. 185-218. Findings reported by Sewell, Haller, and Straus which indicate that there is a relationship between social status and educational and occupational aspiration, when measured intelligence is controlled, suggested that these variables might have some influence on the relationship between achievement orientation and each of social class and expected occupational mobility. William H. Sewell, Archie O. Haller and Murray A. Straus, "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," American Sociological Review, XXII (February, 1957), pp. 67-73.

³Rosen, "The Achievement Motive".

⁴L. Schneider and S. Lysgaard, "The Deferred Gratification: A Preliminary Study," American Sociological Review, XVIII (April, 1953), pp. 142-150.

⁵Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (January, 1959), pp. 337-351.

⁶Rosen, "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation," p. 577.

⁷Ibid., p. 577. (Italics in original.)

⁸LaMar T. Empey, "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), pp. 703-709.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL CLASS, EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: THE REISSMAN SCALE

This chapter reports the results of the section of the study which deals with the relationship between achievement orientation, as measured by the Reissman scale, and each of social class and expected occupational mobility. The procedure is similar to that used in the previous chapter and for this reason some of the more detailed methodological explanatory statements will be eliminated in the interest of brevity. Because none of the chi squares reaches significance it is not necessary that mention be made of it in the interpretation of results.

SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: THE REISSMAN SCALE

Table VII, which shows the relationship between social class and achievement orientation, indicates that these two variables are minimally related ($\text{Gamma} = +.01$). Observation of the percentages suggests that more of the lower class than upper class subjects fall in both the high and low achievement categories. No pattern appears in this table and since the totals are relatively large the conclusion

that the two variables are almost totally unrelated seems to be justified.

TABLE VII
SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION
(REISSMAN SCALE)

<u>Achievement Orientation</u>	<u>Social Class</u>		
	<u>Lower</u> %	<u>Middle</u> %	<u>Upper</u> %
Low	31	24	24
Medium	49	54	60
High	<u>20</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>16</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	74	114	90
<hr/> Chi square = 3.1 (P < .70) Gamma = +.01 <hr/>			

Table VIII shows the relationship between social class and achievement orientation controlling for mid-semester grade average. For the poor performers there is no relationship between class and achievement (Gamma = .00). However, observation of the percentages reveals that 22 per cent of the lower class respondents as compared with only 11 per cent of those in the upper class have high achievement orientations. This suggests a slight tendency for lower class respondents to be more achievement oriented than those in the upper class. For the average performers the relationship is +.09. Finally, for the high performers the relationship

TABLE VIII

SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION BY MID-SEMESTER
AVERAGE (REISSMAN SCALE)

Achievement Orientation of <u>Poor Performers</u>	<u>Social Class</u>		
	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>Upper</u>
	%	%	%
Low	32	17	33
Medium	46	55	56
High	<u>22</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	37	36	18
<hr/> Chi square = 4.0 (P < .50) Gamma = .00 <hr/>			
Achievement Orientation of <u>Average Performers</u>			
Low	30	27	22
Medium	60	54	62
High	<u>10</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	30	67	58
<hr/> Chi square = 2.0 (P < .2.0) Gamma = +.09 <hr/>			
Achievement Orientation of <u>High Performers</u>			
Low	25	33	23
Medium	00	45	54
High	<u>75</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>23</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	4	9	13
<hr/> Chi square = 5.3 (P < .30) Gamma = -.18 <hr/>			

between social class and achievement orientation is $-.18$. Caution should be exercised in interpreting this relationship because of the small total N^S but in observing the percentages for those with high achievement orientation we find a pronounced tendency for those from the lower class to be more achievement oriented than those from either of the two classes above them. A comparison of the three sections of Table VIII does not suggest any consistent trend which might indicate that mid-semester average has a patterned effect on the relationship between social class and achievement orientation.

In Table IX the relationship between social class and achievement orientation, controlling for family size, is presented. For those respondents from small families the relationship between social class and achievement orientation is $+.03$. Observation of the percentages in the body of the table merits mention of the fact that whereas 35 per cent of those in the lower class have low achievement orientations only 21 per cent of those in the upper class have low achievement orientations. For those from average sized families the relationship is $+.04$. The percentages again show that more of the lower class respondents than upper class respondents fall in the low achievement category. Finally, for the

TABLE IX

SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION
BY FAMILY SIZE (REISSMAN SCALE)

Achievement Orientation in <u>Small Families</u>	<u>Social Class</u>		
	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>Upper</u>
	%	%	%
Low	35	23	21
Medium	53	39	68
High	<u>12</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>11</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	17	26	28

Chi square = 8.9 (P < .10) Gamma = +.03

Achievement Orientation in <u>Average Families</u>			
Low	32	24	25
Medium	47	57	55
High	<u>21</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	38	67	55

Chi square = 1.0 (P < .90) Gamma = +.04

Achievement Orientation in <u>Large Families</u>			
Low	26	24	29
Medium	48	67	71
High	<u>26</u>	<u>09</u>	<u>00</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	19	21	7

Chi square = 4.0 (P < .50) Gamma = -.23

respondents from large families the relationship between class and achievement is $-.23$. This is probably explained by the fact that none of the seven respondents in the upper class falls in the high achievement category. Interpretation of this relationship should be made with caution because of the small totals involved for the upper class. However, in studying those with high achievement orientation we find that a greater percentage of lower class (26 per cent) than middle class respondents (09 per cent) fall in this category.

Comparing the three sections of Table IX we again find that no consistent pattern has emerged as a result of the introduction of family size as a control variable. Having observed such low relationships throughout, except for the section on large families which was based on a small total N, it must be concluded that social class and achievement orientation are minimally, if at all, related.

Table X, which shows the relationship between socioeconomic status and achievement orientation is consistent with the trend of results already observed in this chapter ($\text{Gamma} = -.05$). Apparently, even when using both occupation and education as indicators of position in the stratification hierarchy the lower classes are equally as likely to be as achievement oriented as the classes above them. Comparing

those from the lower and upper socioeconomic status in Table X, however, we note a slight tendency for more lower class respondents to have low achievement orientations and more upper class respondents to have high achievement orientations. It appears that the results for the middle class account for the negative relationship. At any rate the relationship between socioeconomic status and achievement orientation is very low.

TABLE X

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION
(REISSMAN SCALE)

<u>Achievement Orientation</u>	<u>Socioeconomic Status</u>		
	<u>Lower</u> %	<u>Middle</u> %	<u>Upper</u> %
Low	31	22	25
Medium	48	63	50
High	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	58	27	28
<hr/> Chi square = 2.8 (P < .70) Gamma = -.05 <hr/>			

One explanation for the low relationships between social class and achievement orientation which has been observed throughout this chapter is that the specific nature of the scale and/or the opportunity for reward increases the

achievement orientation of the lower class subjects. This will be discussed further when achievement orientation as measured by both the Rosen and Reissman scales is dealt with in the next chapter.

Summary:

The results reported in this section support the contention of Reissman and others who maintain that there is either no relationship or a negative relationship between social class and achievement orientation. In studying the "uncontrolled" relationship between social class and achievement orientation we found that the gamma result was $+.01$. Introducing the control variable of mid-semester average did not produce noticeably different results for the poor and average performers (Gamma = $.00$ and $+.09$ respectively). However, for the high performers a gamma of $-.18$ based on a small total N was obtained. The results for small and average families were similar to those obtained in studying the "uncontrolled" relationship (Gamma = $+.03$ and $+.04$ respectively). However, for large families we found a negative relationship between social class and achievement orientation (Gamma = $-.23$). As was the case for high performers in the preceding table it was mentioned that this relationship should be interpreted with caution because of

the small total N on which it was based.

The important point to be noted in this section of Chapter IV is the almost total lack of relationship between social class and achievement orientation where large N^s are involved. At no point did a relationship rise above .09. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a presentation of the data which deal with the relationship between achievement orientation and expected occupational mobility.

EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AND
ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION:
THE REISSMAN SCALE

In Table XI the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation, controlling for social class, is shown. A positive relationship is noted for respondents in the lower class ($\text{Gamma} = +.29$). This indicates that for members of the lower class those who expect to be mobile tend to be more achievement oriented than those who do not expect to be mobile. When subjects in the middle class are studied the relationship between social class and achievement orientation drops to $+.05$. Lower class subjects are almost equally likely to be as achievement oriented as their middle class counterparts. As in the previous chapter, the relationship between expected occupational mobility and

achievement orientation for the upper class is not discussed because with the definition of mobility used these respondents do not appear to be mobile even though they may have high occupational expectations.

In Table XI social class position appears to have a patterned effect on the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation. For the lower class 46 per cent and 27 per cent of the non-mobile and mobile respondents, respectively, have low achievement orientations as compared with respective figures of 24 per cent and 23 per cent for the middle class. For those with high achievement orientations from the lower class the figures are 15 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, for the non-mobile and mobile groups as compared with 19 per cent and 22 per cent for the middle class. As we move from the lower to the middle class there is a tendency for a slightly greater percentage of both mobile and non-mobile respondents to have higher achievement orientations.

According to the result obtained when an absolute definition of mobility is used, and the relationship between respondent's expected occupation and achievement orientation is observed, the two variables are minimally related ($\text{Gamma} = -.03$). By observing the percentages we notice that whereas

TABLE XI

EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT
ORIENTATION BY SOCIAL CLASS (REISSMAN SCALE)

Achievement Orientation of the Lower Class	<u>Expected Occupational Mobility</u>	
	<u>Non-Mobile</u>	<u>Mobile</u>
	%	%
Low	46	27
Medium	39	53
High	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>
Total %	100	100
Total N	13	55

Chi square = 1.8 ($P < .50$) Gamma = +.29

Achievement Orientation of the Middle Class		
Low	24	23
Medium	57	55
High	<u>19</u>	<u>22</u>
Total %	100	100
Total N	37	64

Chi square = 0.1 ($P < .95$) Gamma = +.05

Achievement Orientation of the Upper Class		
Low	19	30
Medium	60	59
High	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>
Total %	100	100
Total N	47	37

Chi square = 2.3 ($P < .50$) Gamma = -.30

27 per cent of the respondents with high occupational expectations score low on achievement orientation only 23 per cent of those with low expectations have low achievement orientations. For high achievement orientation the exact opposite is the case. More of the respondents who expect to be in low occupations score high. There is a tendency for those who do not expect to be mobile to be more achievement oriented. The explanation for this might be that these subjects have made an adjustment to their deprived circumstances and their limited potential for entering high occupations but given the opportunity they might display even higher achievement values than those who expect to enter occupations much higher than their own.

TABLE XII

ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION AND RESPONDENT'S EXPECTED
OCCUPATION (REISSMAN SCALE)

<u>Achievement Orientation</u>	<u>Respondent's Expected Occupation</u>		
	<u>Low</u> %	<u>Medium</u> %	<u>High</u> %
Low	23	30	27
Medium	47	55	56
High	<u>30</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>17</u>
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	30	73	171
<hr/> Chi square = 3.5 (P < .50) Gamma = -.03 <hr/>			

Summary:

In this section we have discussed the results of the portion of the study dealing with the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation as measured by the Reissman scale. For those in the lower class the relationship was $+0.29$ which was a little higher than was expected. This indicates that the non-mobile members of the lower class tend to be less achievement oriented than the mobile members. It might be that the non-mobile members of the lower class do have substantially different achievement values than the mobile members but the fact that 55 expect to be mobile as compared with 13 who do not suggests that lower class members are not apathetic or characterized by defeatism. The relationship for the middle class suggests that there is a minimal relationship between achievement orientation and expected occupational mobility ($\text{Gamma} = +0.05$). Finally, for the relationship between achievement orientation and absolute level of respondents' expected occupation the relationship is again minimal ($\text{Gamma} = -0.03$).

SUMMARY

In the first half of this chapter achievement orientation as measured by the Reissman scale was cross

tabulated with social class. The two variables were found to be almost totally unrelated ($\text{Gamma} = +.01$). When controls were introduced for family size and mid-semester grade average there was little improvement in the relationship. At no point did gamma rise above +09. In the second half of the chapter the Reissman measure of achievement was correlated with expected occupational mobility, controlling for social class. The relationship was found to be +.29 for the lower class but for the middle class it stayed at its predicted low level. As was the case in the preceding chapter the relationship was negative for the upper class. In addition to this the relationship between respondent's expected occupation and achievement orientation was found to be minimal ($\text{Gamma} = -.03$).

Except for the relationship of +.29 between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation which was found for the lower class the relationships observed in this chapter are very low as was predicted in the two hypotheses. In the following chapter the results which were discussed in this and the preceding chapter are compared and the hypotheses are tested.

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL CLASS, EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: THE ROSEN AND REISSMAN SCALES COMPARED

This chapter is a summary of the results reported in the preceding two chapters. Detailed tables are not included. Gamma and chi square measures, with significance levels for the latter, are used in the comparison. In addition to the relationships discussed in Chapters III and IV, summary data are presented on the effects of introducing eight different control variables separately.

SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION

In Tables I and VII social class was related to achievement orientation as measured by the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively. The relationship obtained using the Rosen scale was $+ .31$ while that obtained using the Reissman scale dropped to $+ .01$. Also, whereas the first relationship reached significance the second one was not significant at the $.05$ level. It is clear that the strength of the relationship using the Rosen scale is much greater than when the Reissman scale is used.

In Tables II and VIII (which show comparable results for the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively) a control was introduced for mid-semester average while the relationship between social class and achievement orientation was being observed. A comparison of these results is shown in Table XIII. This table shows that for the poor performers the difference in the results emerging from the two scales is not very great (Gamma = $+.08$ and $.00$ for the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively). For the average performers, the Rosen scale produces a gamma of $+.34$ as compared with a gamma of $+.09$ for the Reissman scale. Finally, for the high performers the Rosen scale shows a relationship of $+.30$ between social class and achievement orientation while the comparable result using the Reissman scale is $-.18$. The negative relationship is partly explained by the fact that 13 of the 26 high performers in Table VIII are from the upper class. It is possible that many of these people take it for granted that they will get ahead in their occupations. In contrast, getting ahead for the lower class students is probably more problematic and more of an obsession. The tentativeness of any interpretation of the third part of Tables II and VIII has already been mentioned and should be kept in mind. All of the relationships in Table XIII are in

the predicted direction and the magnitude of the correlations for the Reissman scale are either close to .00 or negative.

TABLE XIII

GAMMA AND CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION BY MID-SEMESTER AVERAGE (ROSEN AND REISSMAN SCALES) *

<u>Academic Performance</u>	<u>Rosen Scale</u>		<u>Reissman Scale</u>		
	Gamma	Chi Square	Gamma	Chi Square	Number
Poor	+.08	16.7 (P < .01)	.00	4.0 (P < .50)	91
Average	+.34	10.4 (P < .05)	+.09	2.0 (P < .80)	155
High	+.30	3.1 (P < .70)	-.18	5.3 (P < .30)	26

* These data are drawn from Tables II and VIII which report the results for the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively.

Tables III and IX show the relationship between social class and achievement orientation, as measured by the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively, controlling for family size. Table XIV is a summary of these tables. It shows that for large families the Rosen scale produces a gamma result of +.16 as compared with a result of -.23 for the Reissman scale. By referring back to Table IX we notice that only seven of the 47 respondents with large families are upper class. None of these have high achievement orientation and,

with the manner in which gamma is computed, this accounts for the negative relationship. For those from average sized families the relationship using the Rosen scale is +.44 as compared with +.04 using the Reissman scale. Finally, when family size is small, the relationship using the Rosen and Reissman scales differs very little (Gamma = +.02 and +.03 respectively). In this table the relationships for both large and average sized families are in the direction predicted in the first hypothesis.

TABLE XIV

GAMMA AND CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION
BY FAMILY SIZE (ROSEN AND REISSMAN SCALES)*

<u>Family Size</u>	<u>Rosen Scale</u>		<u>Reissman Scale</u>		Number
	Gamma	Chi Square	Gamma	Chi Square	
Large	+.16	3.1 (P < .70)	-.23	4.0 (P < .50)	47
Average	+.44	16.1 (P < .01)	+.04	1.0 (P < .90)	160
Small	+.02	6.4 (P < .20)	+.03	8.9 (P < .10)	71

*These data are drawn from Tables III and IX which report the results for the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively.

Tables IV and X showed the relationship between socioeconomic status and achievement orientation as measured

by the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively. When the Rosen scale was used the relationship between these variables was $+.55$ whereas when the Reissman scale was used the relationship dropped to $-.05$. This again indicates that the lower classes are more achievement oriented when the Reissman scale rather than the Rosen scale is used to measure achievement orientation. These results provide additional support for the first hypothesis.

By introducing eight additional control variables separately and observing the relationship between social class and achievement orientation using both the Rosen and Reissman scales as is done in Table XV, we again find that the trend of the results is in the direction of support for the hypothesis under consideration. In all cases, except the one in which the low occupational aspirers were studied, the relationship between social class and achievement orientation using the Rosen scale is greater than the same relationship when the Reissman scale is used. This is the most important aspect of this scale for present purposes. However, it might also be mentioned that some of these control variables do little to improve the relationship discussed. For example, when the Rosen scale is used, whether or not respondents plan to matriculate from high school has little effect

on the relationship between social class and achievement orientation. The same is the case when we control for best friend's plans for university and whether or not the respondent would like to go to university. These observations are not particularly important for the purposes of this study but it was expected that these variables would increase the magnitude of the relationship for those who: (1) planned to matriculate, (2) would like to go to university, and (3) who had best friends planning on going to university. This was the case, for example, whether or not respondents planned on going to university themselves. For those who did the relationship between social class and achievement orientation was $+0.24$ whereas for those who did not the gamma result was $+0.08$. Also, when the parents did not have an occupational choice for their children the relationship between social class and achievement orientation was high (gamma = $+0.51$) whereas when the parents did have an occupational choice the relationship dropped to $+0.18$. It is obviously important that lower class children receive encouragement from their parents. For the Reissman scale most of the relationships are low except where the total number of respondents falls below thirty. Interpretation of such tables is not attempted at this point because detailed percentage comparisons such

as the ones used in earlier sections are not possible since we are dealing with summary data only.

Our comparison of the results obtained when the relationship between social class and achievement orientation is observed using both the Rosen and Reissman scales to measure the latter variable shows that there is a consistent tendency for the relationship to be higher when the Rosen scale is used than when the Reissman scale is used. Also, when the Reissman scale is used we notice a consistent tendency for the relationship between social class and achievement orientation to either approximate .00 or be negative. Introduction of control variables such as family size and grade average causes no changes in the trend of the relationships. When eight other control variables are introduced the same pattern appears in the results. Finally, when father's occupation as a measure of social class is coupled with father's education to produce a measure of socioeconomic status, the magnitude of the differences between the relationships increases even further. On the basis of these findings Hypothesis 1 is accepted. It states that the magnitude of the relationship between social class and achievement orientation will be considerably greater when the

TABLE XV

GAMMA AND CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION BY EIGHT SPECIFIED VARIABLES
(ROSEN AND REISSMAN SCALES)

	<u>Rosen Scale</u>		<u>Reissman Scale</u>		Number
	Gamma	Chi square	Gamma	Chi square	
Plan to Matriculate	+ .22	10.3 (P < .05)	+ .05	0.3 (P < .90)	105
Do not Plan to Matriculate	+ .21	8.6 (P < .10)	- .01	3.1 (P < .70)	171
Would not like to go to University	+ .29	10.3 (P < .05)	+ .04	0.6 (P < .98)	47
Would like to go to University	+ .28	12.3 (P < .02)	- .04	6.2 (P < .20)	191
Plan to go to University	+ .24	8.9 (P < .10)	.00	2.4 (P < .70)	133
Do not Plan to go to University	+ .08	6.7 (P < .20)	- .08	2.0 (P < .80)	86
Best Friend not Planning University	+ .18	2.5 (P < .70)	- .12	2.0 (P < .80)	84
Best Friend Planning University	+ .21	3.8 (P < .50)	+ .04	2.6 (P < .70)	102
Parents have an Occupational Choice	+ .18	5.1 (P < .30)	+ .05	3.1 (P < .70)	110
Parents have no Occupational Choice	+ .51	15.6 (P < .01)	- .07	4.6 (P < .50)	91

Continued on next page....

TABLE XV (Continued)

GAMMA AND CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
SOCIAL CLASS AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION BY EIGHT SPECIFIED VARIABLES
(ROSEN AND REISSMAN SCALES)

	<u>Rosen Scale</u>		<u>Reissman Scale</u>		Number
	Gamma	Chi square	Gamma	Chi square	
Occupational Aspiration Low	.00	4.9 (P < .30)	+.36	3.9 (P < .50)	18
Occupational Aspiration Medium	+.25	5.1 (P < .30)	-.18	1.6 (P < .80)	49
Occupational Aspiration High	+.25	7.3 (P < .20)	-.03	2.8 (P < .70)	173
Best Friend's Occupation Asp. Low	+.49	4.5 (P < .50)	+.18	4.7 (P < .50)	25
Best Friend's Occupational Asp. Medium	+.25	3.1 (P < .70)	+.03	1.0 (P < .90)	54
Best Friend's Occupational Asp. High	+.28	8.2 (P < .10)	+.07	1.5 (P < .90)	136
Parental Occupational Choice Low	+.19	4.7 (P < .50)	+.37	1.3 (P < .90)	13
Parental Occupational Choice Medium	+.40	2.9 (P < .70)	+.36	4.9 (P < .30)	27
Parental Occupational Choice High	+.15	2.7 (P < .70)	-.05	1.0 (P < .90)	69

Rosen scale is used than when the Reissman scale is used to measure the latter variable.

EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION

Tables V and XI which show the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation, controlling for social class, are summarized in Table XVI. The magnitude of the difference for lower class subjects is not great but it is in the predicted direction. Using the Rosen scale the gamma result is $+.29$. For the middle class subjects the magnitude of the difference is much greater. The magnitude of the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation using the Rosen scale is $+.29$ whereas using the Reissman scale it is only $+.05$. For the upper class the relationships are negative because of the definition of mobility which has been used but the slight difference which appears is in the direction predicted in the second hypothesis. The consistency of results observed in Table XVI indicates that when the Rosen scale is used the relationship between achievement orientation and expected occupational mobility is greater than when the Reissman scale is used, although only for the middle class is there a clear indication of this.

TABLE XVI

GAMMA AND CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AND
ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION
(ROSEN AND REISSMAN SCALES) *

<u>Social Class</u>	<u>Rosen Scale</u>		<u>Reissman Scale</u>		
	Gamma	Chi Square	Gamma	Chi Square	Number
Lower Class	+.34	3.4 (P < .20)	+.29	1.8 (P < .50)	68
Middle Class	+.29	3.0 (P < .30)	+.05	0.1 (P < .95)	101
Upper Class	-.27	2.0 (P < .50)	-.30	2.3 (P < .50)	84

*These data are drawn from Tables V and XI which report the results for the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively.

In preparing Table XVI a relative definition of mobility was used. However, with the data available it was also possible to study the relationship between absolute level of occupational expectation and achievement orientation. Comparing Tables VI and XII which do this for the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively we notice the same trend of results as appeared in Table XVI. The relationship using the Rosen scale is +.23 whereas that using the Reissman scale is -.03.

The explanation for the consistent trend which has been observed in the summary tables on expected occupational

mobility appears to be in the characteristics of the scale used to measure achievement orientation. On the abstract achievement scale used by Rosen the non-mobile respondents appear to be less achievement oriented. However, when presented with the occupational referent and/or the opportunity for reward in terms of occupational advancement they revise their responses and display an achievement orientation which is as high as, and sometimes higher than, that of the mobile subjects. One exception to this was noted for those in the lower classes in Table XVI. Using the Reissman scale the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation was found to be moderately high ($\text{Gamma} = +.29$).

On the basis of the comparison done in this chapter, Hypothesis 2 receives a moderate degree of support although there is no clear indication as there was in the case of Hypothesis 1 that there is a substantial difference in the relationships using the Rosen and Reissman scales. The hypothesis receives some moderate degree of support, however, on the basis of the fact that the differences which have been observed, although some of them are slight, are consistently in the predicted direction. Hypothesis 2 states that the magnitude of the relationship between expected occupational

mobility and achievement orientation, with social class controlled, will be considerably greater when the Rosen scale is used than when the Reissman scale is used to measure the latter variable.

SUMMARY

In this chapter summary tables which compare the results discussed in Chapters III and IV have been presented. The data on the relationship between social class and achievement orientation using the Rosen and Reissman scales showed a decided trend in the direction of support for Hypothesis 1. However, in studying the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation, controlling for social class, the differences were not as consistently in the predicted direction. For this reason Hypothesis 2 is said to have received only a moderate degree of support.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This chapter summarizes the thesis and evaluates the study in terms of how well it clarifies the problem as it was stated in Chapter I. It also relates the findings reported in Chapters III, IV, and V to some theoretical issues in the broader context of the field of sociology.

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of the thesis was to study the relationship between achievement orientation as measured by two scales, one of which does and one of which does not appear to have a middle class bias, and each of social class and expected occupational mobility. Findings in the literature which have been reported by authors who have used the scale which we think has a middle class bias indicate that there is a positive relationship between achievement orientation and each of social class and occupational mobility.¹ Other authors who have used the non-biased scale have reported either negative or no relationship between these variables.²

There are several problems involved in trying to come to any conclusion concerning these apparently contradictory

findings. One is that the samples studied by various authors differ substantially. While some studied adults who are already working, others studied students.³ A second problem is that of definition. Social class may be determined by one or any combination of the following indicators: (1) occupation, (2) education, (3) income, (4) house type, and (5) the area in which one lives.⁴ Social mobility has also been defined differently by various authors. Some have used an absolute definition which means that respondents fall in the mobile category if they have, or expect to have, high occupations or education.⁵ Others have used a relative definition of mobility which involves comparing the occupation which the respondent holds or expects to hold with the one in which his father works.⁶

In this study we were interested in finding out whether or not the type of scale used to measure achievement orientation has an effect on the relationships between achievement orientation and each of social class and expected occupational mobility. By using one population (ninth Grade boys) and a uniform definition of both social class and expected occupational mobility we were in a particularly opportune position to study whether or not this is the case.

The entire Grade nine, male population of the three junior high schools in Jasper Place under the administration of the Edmonton Public School Board was studied. A questionnaire, which included the two scales of achievement orientation, items on father's occupation and education, student's occupational plans and aspirations, and a number of other background items which were used in the introduction of control variables, was administered to the boys in their classrooms.⁷

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

One of the principal findings of the study was that the achievement orientation scale used is important in determining the nature of the relationship between achievement orientation and social class. Using the Rosen scale, in which it appears that achievement orientation is thought to be intrinsically rewarding, the relationship between achievement orientation and social class was found to be considerably higher than when using the Reissman scale, in which the achievement orientation appears to be instrumental in obtaining extrinsic rewards ($\text{Gamma} = .31$ using the Rosen scale and $.01$ using the Reissman scale).

When the control variable of mid-semester average was introduced the difference in relationship for the average and high performers was high. However, for the poor performers the difference was minimal (Gamma = $+.08$ for the Rosen scale and $.00$ for the Reissman scale).

When the control variable of family size was introduced it was found that for those from large and average size families the relationship between social class and achievement orientation differed appreciably when the Rosen and Reissman scales were used alternately to measure achievement orientation. However, for small families the difference in the relationship between the two variables was minimal.

When eight other control variables were introduced the differences noted above obtained in all but two cases. These two were for respondents who had low occupational choices and for students whose parents had low occupational choices for their children. The fact that all other relationships were in the direction predicted provides additional support for the hypothesis.

When father's education was coupled with father's occupation to produce a measure of socioeconomic status the magnitude of the relationship between social class and

achievement orientation, using the Rosen scale, increased considerably while the same relationship, using the Reissman scale, decreased. This suggested that if the indicators used in determining social class had been more precise the magnitude of the difference observed might have been even greater. (The "uncontrolled" relationships between social class and achievement orientation were $+ .31$ and $+ .01$ using the Rosen and Reissman scales respectively while the respective relationships between socioeconomic status and achievement orientation were $+ .55$ and $- .05$.)

On the basis of these findings the first hypothesis was accepted. It predicted that the magnitude of the relationship between social class and achievement orientation will be considerably greater when the Rosen scale is used than when the Reissman scale is used to measure the latter variable.

In the section of the study dealing with the relationship between achievement orientation and expected occupational mobility it was found that when social class was controlled, the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation was consistently higher when the Rosen scale was used than when the Reissman scale was used. The magnitude of the difference for the lower and

upper class was not high but for the middle class the difference was much greater (Gamma = $+.29$, using the Rosen scale and $+.05$ using the Reissman scale).

A similar finding was observed when we studied the relationship between respondent's expected occupation and achievement orientation. When the Rosen scale was used the relationship was much higher than when using the Reissman scale (Gamma = $+.23$ using the Rosen scale and $-.03$ using the Reissman scale). This means that when an absolute measure of mobility is used, the same trend of relationships, as was noted using a relative definition, appears.

On the basis of these findings the second hypothesis received some moderate degree of support. It stated that the relationship between expected occupational mobility and achievement orientation, with social class controlled, will be considerably greater when the Rosen scale is used than when the Reissman scale is used to measure the latter variable.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

In Chapter I we discussed Mizruchi's findings insofar as they relate to the present study. He found that the lower class defined success in terms of material-economic values such as home ownership, job security, and possession

of money whereas the middle class defined success in terms of non-material-economic values such as having many friends, prestige, and education.⁸ He concluded that although both classes were advancement oriented, insofar as they had goals toward which they strived, the lower classes were success oriented while the middle classes were achievement oriented. It appears that our study corroborates this finding insofar as the lower class scores lower than the other classes on the apparently abstract achievement scale (Rosen scale) whereas on the scale with the occupational referent (Reissman scale) they score as highly as, and sometimes even higher than, the classes above them.

Our findings suggest that the lower class respondents are not apathetic and withdrawn as has been suggested by some authors.⁹ The interpretation suggested here is that they display an achievement orientation which is in keeping with their position in life. The old adage that you will not get very far by offering a hungry man religion is well known. Similarly the lower class subjects appear to be interested in having money, steady jobs, and homes before they pattern their behavior on the values of the middle classes. These values are a first step on the road to the more abstract values of the middle classes.

A final implication of this study relates to the increasing necessity for any industrial society to make the best possible use of its scarce human resources. There is some indication that this is not happening in North America. For example, Kahl reports that

. . . the 31 per cent of business leaders who succeeded their fathers in the elite were recruited from only 4 per cent of all fathers in 1920. By chance expectation [assuming a completely open society, with a random relationship between the jobs of sons and fathers] only 4 per cent of the elite should have had fathers in the elite. The ratio of these two percentages is 7.75, indicating that the elite men of 1952 were recruited from elite fathers almost eight times oftener than would be expected under random placement.¹⁰

Findings of this type lead one to wonder whether these people are the best people for the high positions which they inherit. Might it not be possible that under the proper circumstances better qualified men could be recruited from the lower classes. Our findings suggest that lower class people are not apathetic but have certain of the implementary values which are conducive to upward mobility. If these were stressed in the schools and by the parents it might be possible that many of these children with ability would rise further than they do and make greater contribution to society.

FOOTNOTES

¹Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, XXI (April, 1956), pp. 203-211. Also, L. Schneider and S. Lysgaard, "The Deferred Gratification Pattern: A Preliminary Study," American Sociological Review, XVIII (April, 1953), pp. 142-150.

²Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, XVIII (June, 1953), pp. 233-242. Also, Murray A. Straus, "Deferred Gratification, Social Class, and the Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), pp. 326-335.

³Rosen was one of the authors who studied students while Reissman studied adults already located in the occupational structure. Rosen, op. cit. and Reissman, op. cit.

⁴Rosen used occupation, education, and residential area as indicators of social class position. Rosen, op. cit. Reissman used occupation only as an indicator of class position. Reissman, op. cit. Kohn used the indicators of occupation, education, house type, and housing area in his study of social class and values. Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (January, 1959), pp. 337-351.

⁵Irving Kraus, "Sources of Educational Aspirations Among Working-Class Youth," American Sociological Review, XXIX (December, 1964), pp. 867-879.

⁶LaMar T. Empey, "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956) pp. 703-709.

⁷The questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

⁸Ephraim Mizruchi, Success and Opportunity (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 72.

⁹In this review of the literature on classes as ideal types Kahl suggests that one of the emergent values of the lower classes is apathy. He says that "the lower-class persons themselves react to their economic situation and to their degradation in the eyes of respectable people by becoming fatalistic; they feel that they are down and out, and that there is no point in trying to improve, for the odds are against them. They may have some desires to better their position, but cannot see how it can be done." Our study suggests that lower class respondents have these values for improvement and that under the proper circumstances they might not be as fatalistic as they are thought to be. Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1957), p. 211.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 269.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Barber, Bernard, Social Stratification: A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process, New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1957.
- Bendix, Reinhard, and Lipset, Seymour M., (editors), Class, Status, and Power, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953.
- Bendix, Reinhard, and Lipset, Seymour M., (editors), Class, Status, and Power, New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr., Social Statistics, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Blishen, Bernard R., et al., Canadian Society: Sociology Perspectives, New York: The Free Press, 1961.
- Centres, Richard, The Psychology of Social Classes, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- Gordon, Milton M., Social Class in American Sociology, Durham: Duke University Press, 1958.
- Hodges, Harold M., Social Stratification: Class in America, Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1964.
- Kahl, Joseph A., The American Class Structure, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1957.
- Lasswell, Thomas E., Class and Stratum, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.
- Lenski, Gerhard, Power and Privilege, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Lipset, Seymour M. and Bendix, Reinhard, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, Berkley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Loomis, Charles P., Social Systems, Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1960.

- McClelland, David C., et al., The Achievement Motive, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953.
- McClelland, David C., (editor), Studies in Motivation, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955.
- Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1964.
- Mizruchi, Ephraim, Success and Opportunity: A Study of Anomie, New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Porter, John, The Vertical Mosaic, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- Reissman, Leonard, Class in American Society, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961.
- Reisman, David, with Glazer, Nathan, and Denney, Reuel, The Lonely Crowd, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.
- Rosenberg, Morris, Occupations and Values, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.
- Schulberg, Budd, What Makes Sammy Run, New York: Bantam Books, 1961.
- Sears, Robert R., Maccoby, Eleanor E., and Levin, Harry, Patterns of Child Rearing, Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.
- Selltiz, Claire, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Siemens, Leonard B., The Influence of Selected Family Factors on the Educational and Occupational Aspiration Levels of High School Boys and Girls, Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1965.
- Webb, Eugene J., et al., Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Weber, Max, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1958.

Williams, Robin M., Jr., American Society: A Sociological Interpretation, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.

Zeisel, Hans, Say It With Figures, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957.

ARTICLES IN BOOKS

Blishen, Bernard R., "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale", in Blishen, Bernard, et al., Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives, New York: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 477-483.

Centres, Richard, "Children of the New Deal: Social Stratification and Adolescent Attitudes," in Bendix, Reinhard, and Lipset, Seymour M., (editors), Class, Status, and Power, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953, pp. 359-370.

Davis, Kingsley, and Moore, Wilbert E., "Some Principles of Stratification," in Bendix, Reinhard, and Lipset, Seymour M., (editors), Class, Status, and Power, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1966, pp. 47-53.

Hyman, Herbert, "The Value Systems of the Different Classes," in Bendix, Reinhard, and Lipset, Seymour M., (editors), Class, Status, and Power, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1966, pp. 488-499.

Murray, Henry A., "Types of Human Needs," in McClelland, David C., (editor), Studies in Motivation, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955, pp. 63-70.

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Alexander, C. Norma, Jr., and Campbell, Ernest Q., "Peer Influences on Adolescent Educational Aspirations and Attainments," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1964), pp. 568-575.

- Boyle, Richard, P., "Community Influence on College Aspirations: An Empirical Evaluation of Explanatory Factors," Rural Sociology, XXXI (September, 1966), pp. 277-292.
- Chinoy, Ely, "The Tradition of Opportunity and the Aspirations of Automobile Workers," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (March, 1952), pp. 453-459.
- Costner, Herbert L., "Criteria for Measures of Association," American Sociological Review, XXX (June, 1965), pp. 341-353.
- Crockett, Harry J., Jr., "The Achievement Motive and Differential Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review, XXVII (April, 1962), pp. 191-204.
- Davis, Allison, and Havighurst, Robert J., "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," American Sociological Review, XI (December, 1946), pp. 698-710.
- Douvan, Elizabeth, and Adelson, Joseph, "The Psychodynamics of Social Mobility in Adolescent Boys," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVI (1959), pp. 31-44.
- Douvan, Elizabeth, "Social Status and Success Strivings," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), pp. 219-223.
- Duvall, Evelyn Millis, "Conceptions of Parenthood," American Journal of Sociology, LII (November, 1946), pp. 193-203.
- Ellis, Evelyn, "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, XVII (October, 1953), pp. 558-563.
- Empey, LaMar T., "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), pp. 703-709.

- Knupfer, Genevive, "Portrait of the Underdog," Public Opinion Quarterly, XI (Spring, 1947), pp. 103-114.
- Kohn, Melvin L., "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (January, 1959), pp. 337-351.
- Krauss, Irving, "Sources of Educational Aspirations Among Working-Class Youth," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1964), pp. 867-879.
- Kuvlesky, William P., and Bealer, Robert C., "A Clarification of the Concept 'Occupational Choice'," Rural Sociology, XXXI (September, 1966), pp. 265-276.
- Pavalko, Ronald M., and Bishop, David R., "Peer Influences on the College Plans of Canadian High School Students," The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, III (November, 1966), pp. 191-200.
- Reissman, Leonard, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, XVIII (June, 1953), pp. 233-242.
- Rodman, Hyman, "Illegitimacy in the Caribbean Social Structure: A Reconsideration," American Sociological Review, XXXI (October, 1966), pp. 673-683.
- Rodman, Hyman, "The Lower-Class Value Stretch," Social Forces, XLII (December, 1963), pp. 205-215.
- Rosen, Bernard C., "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation," American Sociological Review, XXVI (August, 1961), pp. 574-585.
- Rosen, Bernard C., "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, (April, 1956), pp. 203-211.
- Rosen, Bernard C., and D'Andrade, Roy, "The Psychosocial Origins of Achievement Motivation," Sociometry, XXII (June, 1959), pp. 185-218.

- Schneider, Louis, and Lysgaard, Sverre, "The Deferred Gratification Pattern, A Preliminary Study," American Sociological Review, XVIII (April, 1953), pp. 142-150.
- Sewell, William H., Haller, Archie O., and Straus, Murray A., "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," American Sociological Review, XXII (February, 1957), pp. 67-73.
- Stephenson, Richard, M., "Mobility Orientation of 1,000 Ninth Graders," American Sociological Review, XXII (April, 1957), pp. 204-212.
- Straus, Murray A., "Deferred Gratification, Social Class, and the Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), pp. 326-335.

THESES

- Strong, Mary S., "Social Class and Levels of Aspiration Among Selected Alberta High School Students," unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, 1963.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Department of Sociology

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Jasper Place Junior High School Student Survey

The information collected in this questionnaire is to be used by a Sociology graduate student at the University of Alberta to write a Master's thesis. The study is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. B. R. Abu-Laban. Its purpose is to determine the attitudes and views of high school students on a number of questions related to their future aspirations.

Please do not sign your name to this questionnaire. Your answers are entirely anonymous. In most cases you need only circle the appropriate answer. There are a few cases where you are asked to provide answers. Please write them in the space provided.

Please do not write in the far right column. This is for office use only.

	For office use only						Do not write in this column
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. Are you?	Boy						1 7___
	Girl						2
2. How old are you?	14 or less						1
	15						2
	16						3
	17						4
	18 or older						5 8___
3. How many brothers and sisters do you have?	Brothers _____						9___ 10___
	Sisters _____						11___
4. Are you?	An only child						1
	The oldest child						2
	The youngest child ..						3
	Between the oldest and the youngest						4 12___
5. If you were to evaluate yourself in terms of how well you are doing in school as compared with the other students in your class, where would you place yourself?	Top or uppermost quarter						1
	Second quarter						2
	Third quarter						3
	Lowest quarter						4 13___
6. If you pass your grade nine exams, what program do you intend to take in high school?	Matriculation						1
	General						1
	Commercial						3
	Vocational						4
	Other _____						
	(please specify)						14___
7. What was your Christmas average?	_____						15___
8. If you had good grades and enough money would you like to go to University?	Yes						1
	No						2
	Don't know						3 16___
9. Do you plan to enter Univer- sity after you graduate from high school?	Yes						1
	No						2
	Don't know						3 17___

10. If no, what not?

High school grades too low	1	
Never thought about it	2	
Not smart enough	3	
Parents never encouraged you	4	
Don't need University Education	5	
Can't afford it	6	
Friends are not going	7	
Other (please specify)		
_____	8	18_____

11. What occupation or profession
do you expect to be in when
you are about 25 years old?
(Be as specific as possible.
If you expect to be a Govern-
ment employee, for example,
say whether you expect to be a
clerk or an assistant minister.)

_____ 19_____
20_____

In the last question you
indicated what you actually
plan to do. However, often
times we have to plan to do things
we would not do if circumstances
were different. Therefore, we
would like you to consider the
following question.

12. If you could do what you really
wanted to do, what occupation
would you like to be in when
you are 25 years old?

_____ 21_____
_____ 22_____

13. What occupation or profession
does your best friend of the
same sex plan to enter?
(Again, please be specific)

_____ 23_____
_____ 24_____

14. Is your best friend planning
to go to University?

Yes	1	
No	2	
Don't know	3	25_____

15. Is there any occupation or profession your parents would like you to enter?
- | | | |
|------------------|---|---------|
| Yes | 1 | |
| No | 2 | |
| Don't know | 3 | 26_____ |
- 15.1 If so, what is it? _____ 27_____
- 15.2 If so, do you actually think you will enter this occupation or profession?
- | | | |
|------------------|---|---------|
| Yes | 1 | |
| No | 2 | |
| Don't know | 3 | 29_____ |
16. What is your father's occupation? (Again, please be as specific as you possibly can.) _____ 30_____
- _____ 31_____
17. What is the highest level of education reached by your father?
- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------|
| Didn't reach high school | 1 | |
| Some high school | 2 | |
| High school graduate. | 3 | |
| Trade or technical school | 4 | |
| Some University | 5 | |
| University Graduate . | 6 | |
| Other (please specify) | | |
| _____ | 7 | 32_____ |
18. When you have settled down in your chosen occupation do you expect to be:
- | | | |
|---|---|---------|
| Above the occupational level of your father | 1 | |
| At about the same level as your father. | 2 | |
| Below the occupational level of your father | 3 | 33_____ |

The items on the following pages are concerned with some personal attitudes of yours. There are no right or wrong answers. We are only interested in what you think. Please answer them as carefully as you possibly can.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Do not
write
in this
column

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---------|
| 19. All I want out of life in the way of a career is a secure, not too difficult job, with enough pay to afford a nice car and eventually a home of my own. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 34_____ |
| 20. When a man is born the success he is going to have is already in the cards, so he might just as well accept it and not fight it. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 35_____ |
| 21. Even though parents often seem too strict, when a person gets older he will realize it was beneficial. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 36_____ |
| 22. If my parents told me to stop seeing a friend of my own sex, I'd see that friend anyway. | Agree* 1
Disagree 2 | 37_____ |
| 23. Parents seem to believe that you can't take the opinion of a teenager seriously. | Agree* 1
Disagree 2 | 38_____ |
| 24. Parents would be greatly upset if their son ended up doing factory work. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 39_____ |
| 25. It's silly for a teenager to put money in a car when the money could be used to get started in business or for an education. | Agree* 1
Disagree 2 | 40_____ |
| 26. The best kind of job is one where you are part of an organization all working together, even if you don't get individual credit. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 41_____ |
| 27. Education and learning are more important in determining a person's happiness than money and what it will buy. | Agree* 1
Disagree 2 | 42_____ |

Do not
write
in this
column

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 28. When the time comes for a boy to take a job, he should stay near his parents, even if it means giving up a good job. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 43_____ |
| 29. Planning only makes a person unhappy since your plans hardly ever work out anyway. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 44_____ |
| 30. Even when teenagers get married, their main loyalty is still to their mother and father. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 45_____ |
| 31. Nowadays with world conditions the way they are, the wise person lives for today and lets tomorrow care for iteslff. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 46_____ |
| 32. Nothing in this life is worth the sacrifice of moving away from your parents. | Agree 1
Disagree* 2 | 47_____
48_____ |

*The asterisk indicates that this is the response required if the respondent is to be classified as achievement oriented.

Suppose you were offered an opportunity to make a substantial advance in a job or occupation. Place a check (✓) opposite each item in the following list to show how important it would be in stopping you from making that advance. (Assume you are working in some job or occupation.)

- | | Might stop
me from
making a
change | Would be
a serious matter
consider-
ion but
wouldn't
stop me | Wouldn't
at all | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|---------|
| 33. Endanger your health | _____ | _____ | _____ | 49_____ |
| 34. Leave your family for some time | _____ | _____ | _____ | 50_____ |

Do not
write
in this
column

35. Move around the country a lot	_____	_____	_____	51_____
36. Leave your community	_____	_____	_____	52_____
37. Give up leisure time	_____	_____	_____	53_____
38. Keep quite about your political views	_____	_____	_____	54_____
39. Keep quiet about your religious views	_____	_____	_____	55_____
40. Learn a new routine	_____	_____	_____	56_____
41. Work harder than you did in the job held previously	_____	_____	_____	57_____
42. Take on more responsib- ility than you had in your previous job	_____	_____	_____	58_____

APPENDIX B

ROSEN SCALE

The items on the following pages are concerned with some personal attitudes of yours. There are no right or wrong answers. We are only interested in what you think. Please answer them as carefully as you possibly can.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------|
| 19. All I want out of life in the way of a career is a secure, not too difficult job, with enough pay to afford a nice car and eventually a home of my own. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 34____ |
| 20. When a man is born the success he is going to have is already in the cards, so he might just as well accept it and not fight it. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 35____ |
| 21. Even though parents often seem too strict, when a person gets older he will realize it was beneficial. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 36____ |
| 22. If my parents told me to stop seeing a friend of my own sex, I'd see that friend anyway. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 37____ |
| 23. Parents seem to believe that you can't take the opinion of a teenager seriously. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 38____ |
| 24. Parents would be greatly upset if their son ended up doing factory work. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 39____ |

Do not
write
in this
column

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------|
| 25. It's silly for a teenager to put money in a car when the money could be used to get started in business or for an education. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 40_____ |
| 26. The best kind of job is one where you are part of an organization all working together, even if you don't get individual credit. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 41_____ |
| 27. Education and learning are more important in determining a person's happiness than money and what it will buy. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 42_____ |
| 28. When the time comes for a boy to take a job, he should stay near his parents, even if it means giving up a good job. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 43_____ |
| 29. Planning only makes a person unhappy since your plans hardly ever work out anyway. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 44_____ |
| 30. Even when teenagers get married, their main loyalty is still to their mother and father. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 45_____ |
| 31. Nowadays with world conditions the way they are, the wise person lives for today and lets tomorrow care for itself. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 46_____ |
| 32. Nothing in this life is worth the sacrifice of moving away from your parents. | Agree 1
Disagree 2 | 47_____ |

APPENDIX C

REISSMAN SCALE

Suppose you were offered an opportunity to make a substantial advance in a job or occupation. Place a check (✓) opposite each item in the following list to show how important it would be in stopping you from making that advance. (Assume that you are working in some job or occupation.)

	Might stop me from making a change	Would be a serious consider- ation but wouldn't stop me	Wouldn't matter at all	
33. Endanger your health	_____	_____	_____	49_____
34. Leave your family for some time	_____	_____	_____	50_____
35. Move around the country a lot	_____	_____	_____	51_____
36. Leave your community	_____	_____	_____	52_____
37. Give up leisure time	_____	_____	_____	53_____
38. Keep quiet about your political views	_____	_____	_____	54_____
39. Keep quiet about your religious views	_____	_____	_____	55_____
40. Learn a new routine	_____	_____	_____	56_____

Do not
write
in this
column

41. Work harder than you did
in the job you held
previously

_____ 57_____

42. Take on more
responsibility than
you had in your previous
job

_____ 58_____

B29872